

ST. PAUL'S APPLICATION OF OLD TESTAMENT AND EARLY
JEWISH CONCEPTIONS OF THE SOLIDARITY OF THE HUMAN RACE

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of Divinity

The University of Edinburgh

In Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Russell Philip Shedd
May 1955



INTRODUCTION	Page 1
Chapter I. THE CONCEPTION OF HUMAN SOLIDARITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	1
The Hebrew Concept	2
The Aspect of the Personal Solidarity of the Group	2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer acknowledges with grateful appreciation the help and guidance of his advisors, Professors James S. Stewart, and William Manson, in the limitation, suggestions and criticism proffered in the preparation of this dissertation; to Professor N.W. Porteous and Dr. J.G.S.S. Thompson who gave invaluable criticism of the first chapter; Professors W.D. Davies and T.F. Torrance for suggestions and direction to helpful literature. Thankful appreciation is also extended to the staffs of the New College Library of the University of Edinburgh, the National Library of Scotland, the British Museum, the libraries of Garrett Biblical Institute, McCormick Theological Seminary, and Wheaton Graduate School of Theology. I must also acknowledge the helpful discussions and debates with fellow candidates for post-graduate degrees at New College which have stimulated and aided immeasurably in raising and disposing of innumerable problems which a subject of this nature entails. I am also most grateful to my typists whose aid in the mechanical preparation of the manuscript has been invaluable.

III. THE HEBREW CONCEPTION OF THE SOLIDARITY OF THE HUMAN RACE IN ITS RELATIONSHIPS TO THE OLD TESTAMENT AND EARLY JEWRY	17
The Foundation of the Solidarity of the Race	17
Creation by One God	17
The Fatherhood of Adam and the Terrestrial Character of His Progeny	17

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	Page x
Chapter	
I. THE CONCEPTIONS OF HUMAN SOLIDARITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	1
The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality	2
The Aspect of the Personal Extension of the Group	4
The Implications of Corporate Extension in Punishment and Blessing	16
The Aspect of Realism	37
The Aspect of Oscillation	60
The Unity of the Human Race in the Old Testament	66
II. EARLY JEWISH CONCEPTIONS OF THE SOLIDARITY OF THE HUMAN RACE	78
The Jewish Self-Consciousness of the Solidarity of Israel ...	83
The Unity of Israel in Direct Statements and Analogy	83
The Symbols of Israel's Unity	94
Incorporation into Israel	105
The Organic Continuity of Israel	116
The Implications of National Unity and Continuity in the Solidarity of Israel	122
Jewish Ideas Regarding the Solidarity of Mankind	142
The Unity of the Human Race through Creation	142
The Solidarity of the Human Race in Sin	151
III. THE PAULINE CONCEPTION OF THE SOLIDARITY OF THE HUMAN RACE IN ITS RELATIONSHIPS TO THE OLD TESTAMENT AND EARLY JUDAISM	170
The Foundation of the Solidarity of the Race	177
Creation by One God	177
The Fatherhood of Adam and the Terrestrial Character of his Progeny	187

Chapter		Page
III.(cont.)		
	Adam's Realistic Representation of the Race	195
	The Corporate Transgression	195
	The Corporate Judgment	200
	The Solidarity of Humanity in the Old Aeon	202
IV.	THE SOLIDARITY OF THE NEW HUMANITY IN CHRIST AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE CONCEPTIONS OF SOLIDARITY IN OLD TESTAMENT AND EARLY JUDAISM	231
	The Solidarity of the New Humanity as the Israel of God	235
	The Church as the Israel of God	237
	Elements in the Formulation of Paul's Doctrine of the Church as the New Israel	252
	The Solidarity of the Church as the New Humanity ...	277
	Christ in the Role of the Last Adam	279
APPENDIX A	354
APPENDIX B	364
BIBLIOGRAPHY	370

ABBREVIATIONS

A.P.O.T.	Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament
A.T.R.	Anglican Theological Review
B.D.B.	Brown, Driver and Briggs (Hebrew and English Lexicon)
B.J.R.L.	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
D.S.M.D.	Dead Sea Manual of Discipline
Ex. T.	Expository Times
H.B.z.N.T.	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
H.B.D.	Hastings Bible Dictionary
H.E.R.E.	Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics
H.U.C.A.	Hebrew Union College Annual
I.R.M.	The International Review of Missions
I.C.C.	International Critical Commentary
J.B.L.	Journal of Biblical Literature
Jer. T.	Jerusalem Talmud
J.E.	Jewish Encyclopedia
J.T.S.	Journal of Theological Studies
Lo. Cl. L.	Loeb Classical Library edition
R.A.	Rabbinic Anthology
S.A.S.P.T.	System der Altsynagogalen Palästinischen Theology
S.D.F.O.S.	Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin
T.W.B.B.	Theological Wordbook of the Bible
T.W.N.T.	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament

The common abbreviations for the tractates from the Talmud, Mishna and other Jewish sources have been employed, as well as those in common use to designate books of the Bible, and other more mechanical abbreviations such as p. for page, etc.

PREFACE

The subject under consideration was first brought to the writer's attention by Professor John Sanderson of Faith Theological Seminary. Later Mr. E. Earle Ellis, a friend and fellow-student, gave this subject a limited treatment in a thesis presented to the Faculty of the Wheaton Graduate School of Theology in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts. His study covered briefly the Biblical evidence of a conception of solidarity in the application of punishment and blessing to the group.

The chosen topic was submitted for consideration in a conference with Professor James S. Stewart. Following his approval, the Senatus Academicus of the University of Edinburgh accepted the present title of the thesis in its amended form on May 4th, 1954.

The primary sources for our investigation of the topic are in the first instance, the thirteen generally accepted Epistles of Paul as they are found in the resultant Greek text of Nestle's nineteenth edition. Although the genuineness of Ephesians and particularly the Pastorals has been brought into serious question, it may be assumed for our purposes (which are theological and not critical) that they are Pauline. As to the canon of the Old Testament available to Paul, there is no reason to doubt that its extent was different from its present definition in the Masoretic Hebrew text.¹ The primary sources of Early Jewish thought will be discussed in the introduction to chapter two.

In regard to the secondary sources which treat the life, letters, and doctrine of Paul, there is almost no limit to the amount of literature which might be consulted profitably. There have been more books written which deal

¹Both Josephus and the Talmud indicate clearly that the Jewish Canon consisted of the thirty-nine books contained in the Masoretic Text although they were numbered differently through an early method of grouping.

with Paul than there are years since he lived. It would be both impossible and unnecessary to consult them all especially when it is noted that the background literature covering the Old Testament and Early Judaism is still more prolofic. For this reason the attached bibliography is only representative, not exhaustive. The categories of both "books" and "articles and essays" include only the bibliography to which actual reference has been made in the footnotes or text, not all of the works which have been consulted.

With reference to the mechanics of composition, a few points will suffice: 1) American spelling, punctuation, and rules of grammar are employed, 2) Scriptural quotations generally follow the Authorized Version or the writer's own translation; quotations from either the Revised or Revised Standard Versions are normally indicated by the initials, R.V., and R.S.V., respectively, 3) a number of standard abbreviations as well as those used for convenience are deciphered on p. vii.

Yet, with all of the increased interest in the Biblical conception of unity, it is not work to the writer's knowledge has sought to deal specifically with Paul's conception of human solidarity, particularly in relation to the Apostle's

¹One most possible example is a famous statement made by John Donne approximately a century after the Reformation: "No man is an island, entire of himself; every man is a piece of continent ... If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were ... Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in all mankind ... never send to know for whom the bells toll, it tolls for thee." There is also a strong suggestion of solidarity in the conception of solidarity or "Catholicity" (cf. E. Schille, One Body in Christ, 1955, p. 185 and 187). A. Hyman points out that for a long time, the individualistic conception of man prevailed as an absolutely self-evident presupposition, but is no longer that ("Christ and the Forces of Reconstruction," S.J.E., Vol. 24, p. 573).

INTRODUCTION

Incentives and Justification

Prior to the present ecumenical discussions and current efforts to heal the divisions within the Church, a faint and almost inaudible voice of dissatisfaction was raised to controvert the conceptions of man which saw the race as no more than an aggregation of isolated atoms.¹ This individualistic determination of Western thought since the Renaissance has been effectively challenged from opposite sides. On the one hand there have arisen successive totalitarian systems of government. Under the stimulation of collective ideologies an awareness of a solidarity of race and society has received a modern impetus. On the other hand, in the Christian realm, the increasing fragmentation of the Church in the few centuries since the Reformation has prompted a careful re-examination of the Biblical conception of unity. Out of this double recoil from the totalitarian suppression of individual freedom, and the disunity of the churches, has come a new interest in the Biblical conception of human solidarity. There is, moreover, a new willingness to take the Bible seriously because of the frustration of the current human dilemma.

Yet, with all of the increased interest in the Biblical conception of unity, no major work to the writer's knowledge has sought to deal specifically with Paul's conception of human solidarity, particularly in relation to the Apostle's

¹One most notable example is a famed statement made by John Donne approximately a century after the Reformation: "No man is an island, entire of himself; every man is a piece of continent ... If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were ... Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in all mankind ... never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." There is also a strong awareness of solidarity in the Russian conception of sobornost or "Catholicity" (cf. E. Best, One Body in Christ, London, 1955, p. 185 n.1). A. Nygren points out that for a long time, the individualist conception of man prevailed as an absolutely self-evident presupposition; but it is no longer that ("Christ and the Forces of Destruction," S.J.F., Vol. IV, 1951, p. 373).

Hebraic heritage. Although there are a number of splendid studies which make more or less extensive incursions into this field, they do not adequately present the broad area which our subject embraces.¹ One reason for this is the difficulty one must encounter in producing an acceptable interpretation of the Biblical conception of human solidarity.² The temptation to pass a value-judgment often tends to color the attitude of the investigator. This has formed the challenge and incentive for the investigation of the New Testament ideas on human solidarity as they center in the theology of Paul.³

We must say in passing that in the field of Systematic Theology, particularly since the production of Calvin's institutes, the New Testament problems in under-

¹This observation is limited to English, German and French works which were drawn to the writer's attention in the course of study. We regret that ignorance of Scandinavian languages as well as inaccessibility to such works as A.V. Ström's book, Religion och Gemenskap, Uppsala, 1946, has made a proper recognition of of Scandinavian advances in Biblical theology limited. This limitation has been to a large extent offset, however, by the large volume of works which have appeared in both English and German. E. Bersier, The Oneness of the Race, trans. A. Harwood, London, 1871, scarcely deserves mention as a serious study of Paul's conception of human solidarity.

²The enigma of the New Testament, according to R. Bultmann is: "In short, man is sometimes regarded as a cosmic being, sometimes as an independent 'I' for whom decision is a matter of life or death" ("New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth, ed. H.W. Bartsch, trans. R.H. Fuller, London, 1953, pp. 11f.). L. Champion (The Church of the New Testament, London, 1951, p. 87) has drawn a similar distinction in describing the meaning of religion for Jesus.

³Major doctrines of the New Testament involving the fields of Anthropology, Soteriology, and Ecclesiology, as well as Christology, can be understood only in the light of Paul's conception of human solidarity. The same is true also of numerous key phrases and formulae (e.g. ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς, "in Adam," "in the flesh," as well as the many οὐκ-compounds and the term κοινῶνία), which turn on a proper understanding of the nature of human unity. It is difficult to understand what has prompted W. Morgan (The Religion and Theology of Paul, Edinburgh, 1917, p. 245) to conclude that solidarity in the modern sense of a causal interconnection of all human beings, in society and of one generation with another, Paul knows nothing at all." We trust that an unprejudiced appraisal of the available evidence will demonstrate the error of this position, even if we admit Morgan's limited definition of the term "solidarity."

standing the doctrines of Original Sin, the Biblical concept of covenants, and of the Church, have received a considerable amount of study. More recently, a more strictly Biblical approach has sought to elucidate not only these, but other crucial areas of Pauline thought by studying them in relationship to their Semitic or Hellenistic background. This new emphasis has brought a novel interest in corporate conceptions of Christ and Adam, the Servant of the Lord, and the Son of Man, not to mention such totality denominations as Paul uses to describe the Church (e.g. $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, a corporate temple, etc.). The desire of the writer is to re-examine the conception of human unity which underlies this area of Paul's theology.

Definition and Limitation

The term "solidarity" has been chosen to convey a general area of ideas. The Oxford English Dictionary defines solidarity as, "The fact or qualities, on the part of communities, etc., of being perfectly united or at one in some respect, especially in interests, sympathies, or aspirations." In E. Ehrhardt's helpful article in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, proposes a general definition: "Solidarity is a bond which welds together living, especially human, beings, when they belong to the same whole or are mutually dependent upon each other."¹ Now, it is clear, that this term has many facets which extend as far afield as the general sciences of physiology, sociology and philosophy. Our interest on the other hand is in the Biblical and theological ideas of unity.² In brief, by

¹"Solidarity" ed. J. Hastings, Edinburgh, Vol. XI, 1920, p. 677.

²F. Prat arrives at a practical definition of solidarity when he speaks of a "reversibility of merits and demerits", an idea current in Paul's day and which the Apostle takes for granted without any attempt to justify it (The Theology of S. Paul, trans. J.L. Stoddard, London, 1945, Vol. II, 296). E. Bersier gives us a helpful definition: "By this term (solidarity) is meant that mankind forms one body, not in a figure of speech merely, but as an actual fact; that in his physical, intellectual, and moral nature, man is linked to his fellows by bonds close, intimate and strong, which need clearly to be stated. Science affirms that a child who throws a pebble into the ocean produces a vibration which, passing from molecule

solidarity is meant any unity of intelligencies in which a mutual interaction of influence of consequences is to be discerned and which may be grounded in physical, spiritual, or metaphysical bases. This conception deals primarily with the awareness of a mysterious unity of the race or its segments which justifies a wider application of reward or punishment than to the individual or individuals responsible for these consequences. For this reason, the problem of solidarity is primarily the problem of justice in its most fundamental form.

The use of the term "human race" is not intended to be a limitation of the subject to a consideration of only the totality of the human race. The unity of nations, groups, and families, etc., which are the composites of the whole of humanity also falls within the scope of this investigation.

Although we shall not limit our discussion entirely to the Old Testament and Early Jewish sources of Paul's conception of the solidarity of the race, it might appear at the outset that the topic begs the whole question by limiting our conclusion to Jewish ideas of unity rather than to those found in the contemporary Hellenistic and Gnostic worlds of thought.¹ Justification and reasons for this delimitation will form a major point of contention in the course of our presentation. It might be well to point at present to two important considerations.

1) It is not necessary to appeal to Paul's strict Jewish upbringing to conform an opinion that the Old Testament is of the utmost importance in the determination of the Apostle's doctrine. Both in the frequency with which he refers to the Old Testament in quotation and allusion,² and in the perceptibly uniform grounding of

extends to the very ends of the earth; and it asserts on good grounds, that the same law of transmission prevails in the domain of intelligence and of will. This is what is meant by the law of solidarity" (op.cit., p. 3).

¹Cf. A.S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, Manchester, 1916, p. 7.

²F. Prat lists 78 direct quotations plus many allusions and says, "It has been impossible for us to take into account the passages which refer to a fact or thought of the Old Testament, but without any expression common to both" (op.cit., Vol. I. 41ff.). F.C. Porter ("The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul," J.B.L., Vol. 41, 1922) claims to find citations, reminiscences and allusions amounting to two hundred and forty-five in number.

his theology in the Scriptures, the evidence is incontrovertible that the Old Testament is the most important single factor in Paul's thought background. This is clear from his own statements about the Old Testament:

Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and consolation of the Scriptures we might lay hold of the hope" (Rom. 15:4; cf. I Cor. 10:6,11).

And again:

All Scripture (i.e. the Old Testament) is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work (II Tim. 3:16f.).

For Paul, the Old Testament is the final authority for doctrine and for that reason he repeatedly uses it to close his argument (Gal. 3:22. cf. Rom. 3:9ff., 11:32).

As a Jew, the presumption is unavoidable that the Old Testament should be Paul's overwhelming authority; it was accepted without question.¹ This serves as a sufficient justification for looking in the Old Testament first for Paul's authorization of doctrine. If there is either a close correspondence or general agreement between a conception which the Apostle harbors and one to be found in the Old Testament, there is no presumption in the conclusion that it is his source.

2) What has been said in regard to Paul's relationship to the Old Testament applies with equal force to current ideas on human unity in Judaism. As a Pharisee, Paul's pre-Christian religious thought was determined per force almost entirely by Jewish ideas. In so far as there is any reminiscence of or correspondence with a current Jewish conception of solidarity, it may be safely assumed that extra-Biblical Jewish thought is the background. In this whole issue it is well to heed the authoritative statement of J. Klausner: "There is nothing in all the teaching

¹J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, London, 1938, p. 39. Cf. A.G. Hebert, The Throne of David, London, 1941, p. 22. We will note another consideration pointed out by R.V.G. Tasker as we proceed: "... the Old Testament to St. Paul was a true but incomplete revelation of God" (The Old Testament in the New Testament, 2nd ed., London, 1954, p. 102).

of Paul, as there is nothing in the teaching of Jesus, which is not grounded in the Old Testament or in the Apocryphal-Pseudepigraphal, and Tannaitic literature of the time."¹

Method of Procedure.

The adopted method of procedure is an attempt to present an adequately detailed treatment of the ideas and conceptions of human solidarity as they are found in the Old Testament and Early Jewish literature in the first part. This will provide the background for the second part of the thesis which deals with Paul's conceptions of solidarity specifically. It also attempts to show the correspondence between Paul's doctrines and those ideas discussed in the first part.

Our first and major task is to present the concepts of the Hebrew people of solidarity which have specific reference to Israel.

Because the Old Testament does not confine itself to the religious history of the Hebrew people, there is evidence for a broader solidarity including the whole race. The object of the second part of this chapter is the explication of this conception.

The study of the solidarity of the individual has been relegated to Appendix A, for it does not properly belong in a discussion of racial solidarity. Its usefulness will become apparent in the analogy between the group and the individual and in the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ.

The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality

In an investigation into the cultural phenomena which comprise the religious and sociological history of the people of Israel, the contrast between Eastern Semitic thought and the western Western mind is readily apparent. One of the most fundamental individualistic attitudes of the West since the Renaissance

¹From Jesus to Paul, trans. W.F. Stinespring, New York, 1944, p. 482. Cf. A.C. Headlam, St. Paul and Christianity, London, 1913, pp. 13ff.

CHAPTER I

THE CONCEPTIONS OF HUMAN SOLIDARITY IN

THE OLD TESTAMENT

Introduction

Solidarity and its implications were very important elements in Israelite life during the period of the Old Testament. There is scarcely a page of Sacred History which does not multiply the evidence for a strong group-unity. Since the consciousness of group-solidarity primarily revolved around the clan and nation, our first and major task is to present the aspects of the Hebrew conception of solidarity which have specific reference to Israel.

Because the Old Testament does not confine itself to the religious history of the Chosen Race, there is evidence for a broader solidarity including the whole race. The object of the second part of this chapter is the examination of this conception.

The study of the solidarity of the individual has been relegated to Appendix A, for it does not properly belong in a discussion of racial solidarity. Its usefulness will become apparent in the analogy between the group and the individual and in the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ.

The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality

In an investigation into the cultural phenomena which comprise the religious and sociological history of the people of Israel, the contrast between ancient Semitic thought and the modern Western mind is readily apparent. Over against the fragmentary individualistic attitude of the West since the Renaissance, the thinking of Israel must be classified as synthetic. It has been described by

the phrase, "grasping of a totality."¹ Phenomena were perceived as being part of some total relationship. This Semitic outlook is evident in the language, laws, worship, and in the conception of man. The individual was thought of as a part of some psychic whole such as the nation.² "Within that whole, there were lesser wholes to which he also belonged — the clan, the local community, the family — and he was more conscious of his share in the life of these wholes than he was of his own individual existence."³

The term "corporate personality" has been coined and popularized by H.W. Robinson to describe this conception. Corporate personality involves two basic elements which are used in the definition of a corporation according to English law: 1) a body that is authorised to act as an individual, 2) an artificial person (authorized) and having the capacity of perpetual succession.⁴ Thus, the application of the term to a group, means that a nation or family, including its past, present and future members might function as a single individual through any one of those members conceived as a representative of it.⁵ The community was therefore conceived as an interminable continuity. The group-consciousness, moreover, is analogous to the idea of personality. True, the ultimate values were still those of the individual apprehension, but these were modified in important ways.⁶ As we proceed with the investigation of this

¹A.R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, Cardiff, 1949, p. 7.

²E.C. Rust, Nature and Man in Biblical Thought, London, 1953, p. 50.

³Ibid., p. 50.

⁴H.W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," Werden und Wesen, Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 66, Berlin, 1936, p. 49.

⁵Ibid., p. 49.

⁶H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, Edinburgh, 1911, p. 28. Cf. H.W. Robinson, "The Group and the Individual in Israel," The Individual in East and West, ed. E.R. Hughes, London, 1937. p. 153.

modification, a better understanding of the idea of a single community personality will emerge. The term "corporate personality" was not chosen to be distinguished from solidarity. It does define more precisely the variety of solidarity which is to be found in the Old Testament.

The term "personality" may at first appear to have been misused; but, if in contrast to Plato's "simple" soul (the "ego" retaining throughout all changes, the unanalyzable awareness of identity), we adopt a definition proposed by C.H. Dodd, we may be persuaded otherwise.

In actual fact, human personality, as we know it in ourselves, is not "simple" but indefinitely complex. In particular it is constituted out of personal relations. From the beginning of our individual existence we throw out tenacles, as it were, to other persons, and they throw out tenacles out to us ...¹

If the individual personality refuses complete comprehension, we may be excused for an obscure presentation of the conception of a corporate personality. The difficulty is apparent as soon as we attempt to proceed beyond a simple definition of the Hebrew conception of the unity of the group to a reason or rational basis for the same. The all too common practice of dismissing the strong sense of solidarity in the Old Testament on the grounds of the primitive frame of reference in which it is found, is finding less and less favor in recent studies. The problem is of special interest as we become more aware of the place solidarity must play in the modern world and in discussions on the unity of the Church.

The adopted method of procedure is the examination of four general aspects of the Hebrew conception of unity. These aspects are not necessarily progressive or logically dependent. They are merely convenient titles under which to

¹C.H. Dodd, The Communion of Saints, Cambridge, Mass., 1936, p. 9. Cf. N. Micklem, The Open Light, London, 1919, p. 73. Recent discussion of this point is more willing to accept the idea of personality diffusion. We may cite for example C.R. Smith: "It has been thought that personality separated the members of a society but it is now doubted by students of psychology whether it separates as much as was supposed." This author continues by posing the question as to whether there may not be a connection underneath man's apparent independence. The Bible Doctrine of Society, Edinburgh, 1920, p. 271.

group the varied evidence to be culled from the Old Testament to both support and explain the Hebrew conception of corporate personality.

The Aspect of the Personal Extension of the Group

1. The Identification of the Family with its Ancestor: A number of ideas held by the ancient Hebrews support the contention that the personality of the group transcended both space and time limitations. One of these ideas lies behind the statements which identify a race with its ancestor. There was a very strong sense of solidarity which produced a consciousness of continuous extension crossing the barriers of succeeding generations and uniting the whole group.¹ This unity stemmed directly from the ancestor of the nation. Indeed, the life of the ancestor was conceived as extending itself in his children.

This idea occurs frequently in the Old Testament. For the purpose of illustration we may note Malachi 1:3,4 where Esau and the nation of Edom are equated. Israel as a nation and Jacob as the paternal source are often indistinguishable as in Isaiah 41:8: "But thou, Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend." It is particularly difficult to determine in the genealogies of Genesis 9:18 and 10:15ff. whether only individuals alone or ancestors and the tribes which came from them are designated.² In any case, with relative frequency, a city or nation bears

¹Cf. S.A. Cook, Cambridge Ancient History, Cambridge, 1925, vol. III, 438.

²Cf. M. Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology, Philadelphia, 1946, p. 143. O.J. Baab outlines the more extreme position: "While scholars are not in entire agreement, many are on record as asserting the probability that each patriarch is actually a tribe or a clan ... This view gains support from the hints or even the precise statements in the Bible itself. We may note the words 'Esau (that is, Edom)' in the story of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 36:1). The language of another passage (Gen. 10) strengthens this view. Here the so-called individual descendants of Noah are given names which are used elsewhere for nations. For instance, 'the descendants of Ham were Elam, Assyria (Gen. 10:6,22).' The Theology of the Old Testament, Nashville, 1939, p. 56.

the name of its founder which implies more than the mere identity of appellation.¹

In the same category we may place the conception of a nation biography. The nation is treated as an individual. The events and history of the nation are related as though they belonged to the biography of the ancestor. Thus we read in Hosea 11:1, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." The mercies of God to Israel in the wilderness are recounted before the Congregation in the second person singular in Deuteronomy 8:2ff. The nation as a whole forms a corporate personality or individual. The history of the race is the biography of the national super-individual.

This conception is well illustrated in the contention that the sons and succeeding generations may share in the experiences of their ancestors. This idea was especially applied to the great events of Israel's history such as the Exodus and the establishment of the Covenant. Moses controverts the notion that sons are not involved in the decisions of their fathers. "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us alive here this day" (Deuteronomy 5:3. Cf. 5:6, 6:12). The actual generation bound by the covenant at Sinai, had perished in the wilderness as had the Jews which were redeemed from Egypt, but Joshua addresses his own generation in the name of the Lord:

And I brought your fathers out of Egypt: and ye came unto the sea; and the Egyptians pursued after your fathers with chariots and horsemen unto the Red Sea, and when they cried unto the Lord, he put darkness between you and the Egyptians, and brought the sea upon them, and

¹Apollodorus provides an excellent parallel to this idea: "Reigning over the Egyptians, Epaphus married Memphis, daughter of Nile, founded and named the city of Memphis after her, and begat a daughter Libya after whom the region of Libya was called." The Library, Loeb ed., London, 1921, I, 135 (II, 1.4). A more remote parallel is found in the ideas of primitive societies as Lévy-Bruhl comments: "Each individual is at one and the same time such and such a man, or such and such a woman, actually alive, and such an ancestral individual (human or semi-human) who lived in the mythical times of the Alcheringa; at the same time he is his totem, i.e., he participates mystically in the essence of the vegetable or animal species of which he bears the name." How Natives Think, trans. L.A. Clark, London, 1925, p. 91.

covered them; and your eyes have seen what I have done in Egypt; and ye dwelt in the wilderness a long season (24:6).

Throughout the passage there is an apparent confusion of generations which would not have been felt as confusion by the Hebrew mind. Hundreds of years after the Exodus, the Lord addresses the nation by Amos, "Hear this word ... O children of Israel ... which I brought up from the land of Egypt" (3:1). The rationale behind the release of the bond-servant on the year of jubilee is stated thus: "For they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt ..." (Leviticus 25:42).

The Jewish Passover, beyond question the most important of Jewish festivals, was a feast of re-experience, not merely commemoration. Every Israelite was carefully instructed that the significance of the feast lay in the re-living of the events upon which their existence as an independent nation was based.¹ Each generation, each year, realistically thought of itself as participating realistically in the experience of their fathers in the dawn of their history.

2. The Hebrew Conception of a Name: - Closely parallel to the ideas of identification which we have discussed was the conception of a name. Rather than thinking of one's name as a convenient aid to distinguish himself from others, the early Israelite viewed a name as bearing character. As the household bore the name of the father, the patriarch's character imbued the house. The son bore the dignity or dishonor of his father because he was called by the parent's name.

With limitations, one may see some truth in Pedersen's discussion of the ancient Semitic conception of the name. "The name is the soul; the heritage consisting in the name is not an empty appellation, a sound, but the substance

¹J. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, vols. III-IV, trans. A. I. Fausbøll, London, 1940, p. 401. Cf. H. Sahlin, "The New Exodus According to S. Paul," The Root of the Vine, ed. A. Fridrichsen, Edinburgh, 1953. p. 84.

of a soul."¹ Thus by passing on one's name to a son, in a sense, one does not die. It was for this reason that the Israelite wished for a son more than for anything on earth.² The possession of sons to bear the name of their father was desirable because it made the ancestor great. Throughout the Old Testament there is a constant identity of the name with one's seed. They are co-extensive, as Isaiah 66:22 indicates, "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain" (cf. Numbers 27:4). Abraham's name is made great through his progeny. "And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing" (Genesis 12:2). The great nation which bears the name of Abraham is identified with its ancestor. Although the passage speaks of blessing through Abraham in individual terms, the fulfilment of the promise is carried out through Israel (cf. vs. 3).³ It is small wonder that David, the king, is not insulted at the expressed wish of his courtiers, "God make the name of Solomon better than thy name, and make his throne greater than thy throne" (I Kings 1:47). To have a son with a greater name meant simply

¹J. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, trans. A. Møller, London, 1926, I-II, 254. Such an understanding of the name must recognize the soul, not as limited to the ego as the conscious finished personality, but everything that fills it, i.e. renown, property, or realm in which it works. Cf. ibid., A.R. Johnson discusses the subject at length, op.cit. passim. Cf. Lévy-Bruhl, op.cit. p. 121.

²Cf. G.A.F. Knight, From Moses to Paul, London, 1949, pp. 37f.; M. Burrows, "Levirate Marriage in Israel," J.B.L., vol. LIX, 1940, p. 31.

³It is essential to note that although Abraham had more than one son, it is only Isaac which bears the Patriarch's name and therefore his character (cf. Gen. 21:12). The writer of the Book of Jubilees is in a direct line with his Hebrew heritage when he says: "This house have I built for myself that I might put my name upon it in the earth ... and it shall be named the house of Abraham; it is given to thee (Jacob) and to thy seed forever; for thou wilt build my house and establish my name before God forever; thy seed and thy name will stand throughout all generations of the earth" (22:24; cf. 16:17, 19:16, 31:18, "May thy name and the name of thy sons go forth and traverse every land and region).

that one's own honor was increased.¹ S.A. Cook correctly and cryptically defines the name as both the label and the packet.² A good name is in a real sense a good heritage.

As the Israelite felt that he went on living in his children to a degree that really made their life his own, the name conveyed the idea of this life-relationship in an unsevered state. It follows that "cutting off of the name from the earth" is more than the destruction of a single individual. It is rather, the extermination of a family-line (cf. Joshua 7:9, Deuteronomy 29:20, II Kings 14:27, I Samuel 24:21, 22). The institution of Levirate marriage was designed to avoid the danger of a family line being extinguished through the death of a childless father. Thus the law states that the first-born of the new union (wife and the deceased man's brother) was to succeed in the name of the deceased brother, "... that his name be not put out of Israel" (Deuteronomy 25:6).

The identity of the name with the family life is emphatically expressed by Bildad in his description of the fate of the wicked: "His remembrance shall perish from the earth, and he shall have no name in the street ... He shall neither have son nor nephew among his people, nor any remaining in his dwellings" (Job 18:17, 19).³ By way of contrast, David has been elected to the role of king over Israel forever (I Chronicles 28:4) in that the "sons of David," that is, those that bear his name will carry on his life.⁴

¹J. Pedersen, I-II, 254.

²The Old Testament: a Re-interpretation, Cambridge, 1936, p. 106.

³Cf. A.R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, Cardiff, 1942, p. 8.

⁴Cf. H.W. Robinson, Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, London, 1913, p. 91; A.R. Johnson, "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," The Labyrinth, ed. S.H. Hooke, London, 1935, p. 75; M. Burrows, "Levirate Marriage in Israel," op.cit., p. 31. The Israelite of the nation's early days found a sort of survival in his family (cf. W.A. Irwin, "The Hebrews," The Intellectual

3. The Hebrew Conception of the Family: Closely allied to the understanding of a name is the ancient conception of the family. One cannot easily separate the idea of a common name derived from an ancestor, from the notion of family participation in a common flesh. Common flesh, like a common name, makes for a common character.¹ As the flesh of the son is derived from his father, the ancestor is the source of the community of flesh which pervades all of his descendants — those that form his family.² The idea will be clarified by examining the social conception of a single immediate family.

The man of the house was known as the אֲדֹנָי . The significance of the term extends beyond that of a husband or father to idea of lordship. אֲדֹנָי implies not only ownership³ but also complete responsibility for the family.⁴ He was the center from which strength and will emanate.⁵ Speaking of the relationship of father to family, C.R. Smith says, "He was responsible for all its members, and his acts bound them; they shared his prosperity or his poverty, his eminence or his doom; they were part and parcel of him."⁶ This

Adventure of Ancient Man, ed. H. Frankfort, Chicago, 1946, p. 264) which roughly corresponds to the New Testament doctrine of a future blessedness. See Deut. 4:40 for a striking illustration.

¹J. Pedersen, I-II, 48.

²L. Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, Tübingen, 1947, pp. 147f.

³Cf. D. Daube, Studies in Biblical Law, Cambridge, 1947, p. 169.

⁴See Brown, Driver and Briggs, A Hebrew Lexicon of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1952, p. 127. Cf. L. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, Chicago, 1912, p. 41.

⁵J. Pedersen, I-II, 62. Cf. G.A.F. Knight, op.cit., p. 36. The baalim (i.e. Canaanite deities mentioned in the Old Testament) is the plural of baal, which signified "possessor of the land." C.H. Patterson, The Philosophy of the Old Testament, New York, 1953, p. 55; Cf. O.S. Rankin, T.W.B.R., p. 95.

⁶The Bible Doctrine of Society, op.cit., p. 76. L. Köhler denies that the Covenant had any relationship except to men, op.cit., p. 52.

relationship, founded on the basis of a blood-relationship, established a type of psychic unity. The blood of a living creature contained the life of that organism (cf. Genesis 9:4, Deuteronomy 12:23);¹ hence, every member of the family by virtue of a common descent partook of the same blood and consequently of the same life.² In other words the family formed a corporate personality which is elemental in the social concepts of that period.³ For this reason Rachel wept in Jeremiah's day (cf. 31:15) as well as during the slaughter of the innocent children (Matt. 2:17f.). She suffers the same fate as her progeny.⁴ Abraham possesses the Land of Promise as Genesis 13:15-17 states: "For the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever ... Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee." When Israel finally possesses the land almost five hundred years later it is equivalent to the fulfillment of this promise, because it is the family of Abraham and the extension of his life.

This manner of thinking makes gaps in genealogy insignificant. Thus Jacob's children are claimed by Laban to be his own (Genesis 31:43) although he was actually their grandfather. Representatives from Israel are not loath to argue with Edomites regarding unrestricted passage through Edom, because Jacob and Esau are brothers (Numbers 20:14). Matthew's familiar genealogy of Jesus Christ, "the son of David, the son of Abraham," illustrates the same point (cf. 1:1).

¹Cf. W.R. Smith, The Religion of the Semites, 3rd ed., London, 1927, p. 40; L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 131.

²W.R. Smith, op.cit., p. 41.

³Cf. S.A. Cook in notes appended to the 3rd ed. of The Religion of the Semites, op.cit., p. 506.

⁴Cf. H.W. Robinson, Werden und Wesen, op.cit., p. 52.

Involved in the identity of the father and his family is the ancient conception of the blood-bond. Among the earliest bases of kinship was the idea of a common participation in one blood.¹ The blood-bond was the unifying factor of kinship. The kin-group fluctuated in direct response to the strength (recognized) of the blood tie. Therefore, "to the primitive man all other men fall under two classes, those to whom his life is sacred and those to whom it is not sacred."² This involved the practice of blood-revenge which was the practical test of kinship, in that the whole clan was answerable for the life of each of its members. There were limitations placed on the practice of revenge³ through a relative in the cases of manslaughter, (Num. 35:9ff), but it was considered legitimate in cases of murder (vvs. 21,24).

In the event that the guilty party could not be seized for punishment, vengeance was satisfied by the son. This principle was enforced in the death of Saul's seven sons. Saul had broken the treaty contracted by Joshua with the Gibeonites (cf. Josh. 9:15). Since redress could not be secured during Saul's tenure of office, the death of his sons satisfied the Gibeonites' demands for justice (II Sam. 21:1ff.).⁴ Similarly, the guilt incurred by Ahab through his avaricious judicial murder of Naboth was avenged in the death and ignominious burial of Joram, Ahab's son (II Kings 9:26).⁵ In a realistic

¹W.R. Smith, op.cit., p. 41. Cf. A. Lods, Israel: From its Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century B.C., trans. S.H. Hooke, London, 1932, p. 198.

²W.R. Smith, op.cit., p. 272, Cf. W.A. Irwin, The Old Testament: Keystone of Human Culture, New York, 1952, pp. 202f.

³See H.H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament, London, 1952, pp.170f.

⁴Cf. H.W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 88, and The Christian Doctrine of Man, op.cit., p. 28.

⁵Although M. David, "The Codex Hammurabi and its Relation to the Provisions of Law in Exodus," Oudtestamentische Studien, Vol. VII, Leiden, 1950, p. 153,

sense, the son, through the blood-bond, partook of the life of the father; therefore, the son might inherit the penalty which was in reality the due of the parent. There was no problem of injustice involved, since the family or kin-group composed a corporate personality.¹

From the immediate בן־בית and the obvious kinship of the family, the unity of the larger community was derived. It was imbued with the common character and spirit which characterized a family.² For this reason it was quite proper to refer to a tribe or clan as a family. Therefore, we read that Manoah came from the "family of the Danites" (Judges 13:2, cf. 17:7, 18:19). A passage such as Exodus 6:14, "The sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel: Hanoch, and Pallu, Hezron, and Carmi: these be the families of Reuben" (cf. vs. 15, 19, 25, Num. 3:15), indicates that the tribal family was itself composed of families which correspond roughly to clans.³ They are accorded very little prominence in the Biblical record in comparison with the tribe.

Since the בן־בית was thought of as a psychic community, it is not surprising that occasionally instead of בן־בית , the Hebrews used the word עמ

finds no evidence that the Biblical legislator knew or was influenced by the Code in any way, there are some notable parallels. Note e.g. Article No. 210, "If a man has caused a woman's death in a certain way, his own daughter is killed." Article No. 230, "If a builder has built a house so badly that the owner's son is killed by its falling, the builder's son is to be killed."

²W.R. Smith makes a significant statement in this regard, "The whole kindred conceives itself as having a single life, just as in the formula 'our blood has been spilt' it speaks of itself as having but one blood in its veins." Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, Cambridge, 1885, p. 40; cf. p. 25. Thus the Arabian tribesmen in a case of homicide say, "Our blood has been spilt." This expression corresponds to the Hebrew, "I am your bone and your flesh" (cf. Judges 9:2, II Sam. 5:1). W.R. Smith, The Religion of the Semites, op.cit., p. 274.

²Cf. J. Pedersen, I-II, 57; L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 114.

³Cf. B.D.B., op.cit., p. 1046.

signifying those related as a community of life¹ (cf. II Sam. 23:13, Num. 32:41, Deut. 3:14, Judges 10:4, I Kings 4:13, Psalms 68:11).² This word is important because it indicates that early Hebrew thought actually conceived of kinship in terms of vital ties. In I Samuel 18:18, the incorrectly pointed לִי (to read "my life")³ probably should be referred to relatives: "And David said unto Saul, Who am I? and who are my kinsfolk, my father's family in Israel, that I should be son in law to the king?"

In the broader context of the clan, tribe, or even nation, such distinctions of relationship as אָבִיבִי, "brother," אֶחָיו, "kinsman," and רֵעִי, "fellow," "neighbor," become indistinct. The lack of precision is especially evident in Leviticus 19:16-18, where they are used promiscuously and carry the same meaning.⁴ Again, David argues for re-instatement to the throne by appealing to the elders of Judah as members of his own family: "You are my kinsmen (actually אֶחָיו "brothers"), you are my bone and my flesh ..." (II Sam. 19:12,

¹J. Pedersen, I-II, 50. B.D.B. take II Sam. 23:11, "assembled into a troop" as dubious on the authority of Ewald, Driver and others. Of v. 13, however, the rendering, "... and a community(עַמְּהֶם) of Philistines (i.e. a group of allied families making a raid together) was encamping," is doubtless correct (cf. I Chron. 11:15 עַמְּהֶם). Cf. B.D.B., op.cit., p. 312.

²In these passages the A.V. translation "towns" or "troops" and the R.S.V. rendering, "villages," "cities," or "bands," might well be changed to "clans" or "encampments" in the non-permanent Bedouin fashion. The עִיר and עָרִים "city" are contrasted (cf. Num. 32:36, 42 with 41). W.R. Smith may be quoted appropriately: "The Arab kindred group or hayy, as we know it, was a political and social unity, so far as there was any unity in that very loosely organised state or society ... To get the full benefit of this mutual support, the group or hayy must not only fight together, but as far as possible move together ... The unity of the hayy was maintained only by the principle that all must act together in war (i.e. blood-feud), and that no one must protect his kinsman for the murder of a man of his own blood." Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, op.cit., pp. 36ff. Cf. H.W. Robinson, "The Group and the Individual in Israel," op.cit., p. 156.

³Cf. A.V. rendering of the Masoretic text.

⁴J. Pedersen, I-II, 57.

R. S. V.). All the members of the tribe partake of a common brotherhood.¹ So Lot is referred to as Abraham's brother although in truth he was a nephew (cf. Gen. 14:16 with 11:27,31). So also the record calls Laban and his retinue the brethren of Jacob although in reality they were uncle and nephew (cf. Gen. 31:54).

Finally, the term בית is used to designate a family. The original meaning of the word is "thousand" usually referring to a military division. But union under one leader fosters the idea of community.² It is indeterminate in Judges 6:15 whether Gideon speaks of his "clan" (R. S. V.) or a former cadre which had been dissolved in the tribe of Manasseh (note further I Sam. 10:19, Num. 10:36, 31:5, Josh. 22:14, and I Sam. 23:23). In Pedersen's estimation, the term בית denotes the family idea of community and is applied to a division by derivation.³ In any case, it carries the idea of solidarity.

Beyond the application of the idea of kinship to the tribe, there are passages of the Old Testament which designate the nation of Israel as a family.⁴ Therefore, Moses looks upon the burdens of his brethren for any Hebrew is his brother (Ex. 2:11, Heb. Cf. Lev. 10:6, II Sam. 19:42, Jer. 34:14). All Israelites are brothers and belong to a single household, even though one may be a slave to another (Deut. 15:12). Jeremiah says, "The Lord has rejected the two families which he chose" (33:24, R. S. V.), indicating the divisions of the kingdom following the reign of Rehoboam.⁵ In Amos 3:2, the Lord speaks,

¹J. Pedersen, I-II, 59.

²Ibid., p. 50.

³Ibid., p. 50.

⁴Cf. H. W. Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology," The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake, Oxford, 1925, p. 377; J. Pedersen, I-II, 59.

⁵Jer. 2:4, "Hear the word of the Lord, O house of Jacob, and all the

"You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities." Israel is but one of the nation-families that people the earth. The same terminology is used in the covenant of Abraham (Gen. 12:3, "... all the families of the earth ...") and Jeremiah's denunciation of the nations in Jeremiah 10:25.

Although there is no reference which refers to the human race as a single family, the Old Testament might well have done so. For the idea upon which the conception of the nation as a family was based, was identical to that upon which the unity of the immediate family rested. That basis was the one ancestor who was to the tribe or nation what the $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{א} & \text{ב} & \text{ג} \\ \text{א} & \text{ב} & \text{ג} \end{smallmatrix}$ was to the household unit. The foregoing discussion indicates a vertical extension of the life of the ancestor. The extension and expansion of the original family of the patriarch was promulgated through his progeny, generation upon generation ad infinitum. Man was what he was only as a link in that family.¹

The Old Testament traces the origin of the human race to one man, Adam (cf. Gen. 1:26,27; 2:7; note also that all men are descended from Noah, Gen. 7:23, 9:1). On this basis it is not too much to suppose that to anyone who considered the whole of mankind as descended from Adam and Eve, it would not be illogical to think of all men in the broadest sense as brothers and belonging to the same $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{א} & \text{ב} & \text{ג} & \text{ד} & \text{ה} \\ \text{א} & \text{ב} & \text{ג} & \text{ד} & \text{ה} \end{smallmatrix}$.² Because the solidarity of any group is developed

families of the house of Israel" (R.S.V.) shows the ambiguity which characterizes the word. C.Lathey is quite correct in saying, "The solidarity of the clan ($\begin{smallmatrix} \text{א} & \text{ב} & \text{ג} & \text{ד} & \text{ה} \\ \text{א} & \text{ב} & \text{ג} & \text{ד} & \text{ה} \end{smallmatrix}$) involved of course the solidarity of the larger units containing it, the tribe and the nation." "Vicarious Solidarity in the Old Testament," Vetus Testamentum, Vol.I, Leiden, 1951, p. 271. Cf. G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, London, 1954, p. 49.

¹J. Pedersen, op.cit., I-II, 259. Cf. L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 114; W. Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, Vol. II, Zurich, 1948, p. 91.

²Cf. S.A. Cook, Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., III, 438, where he concludes, "... the fundamental principles are the same, and it was possible to extend the limits of the group to all mankind."

on empirical rather than on theoretical grounds, it cannot be considered strange that this most expanded form of unity did not receive formal adoption. As W.R. Smith has so convincingly argued, the main cause for the strong consciousness of psychic unity in the broader community of the clan or tribe was the common danger of obliteration through war and raids.¹

The Implications of Corporate Extension in

Punishment and Blessing

1. Punishment Extended to Later Generations. - The most obvious consequence of the vertical extension of the personality of the group is the application of merit or demerit to those who did not individually participate in its cause. A succinct statement of this principle is found in Exodus 20:5f.:

... for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

Later history gave Israel cause to make frequent reference to the principle involved, even to the extent of giving it a proverbial counterpart, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," which found common expression in Ezekiel's day (cf. Ezekiel 18:2). As the wickedness of the father stained the history of his children's generations, Jews were forced to give the problem of corporate justice careful consideration. As in the case of the shamelessness of Canaan's father Ham (Gen. 9:20ff.) or the opposition of Amalek to Israel (Ex. 17:8ff.), men and women had to suffer because of their descent (cf. I Sam. 15:2ff.).²

¹W.R. Smith, Kinship and Marriage, op.cit., p. 56. This is not a contradiction of the point made above that the unity of the group presupposed the common blood, i.e. the common ancestor. Here reference is made to the element that made this unity a conscious reality to the individual members.

²S.A. Cook, Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., pp.438f.

The extension of punishment to the second generation is the most frequent example of the application of this principle of corporate justice in the Old Testament. It may be helpful to examine a few of the more prominent passages in the Biblical record where punishment is shown to involve innocent individuals.

The rebellion of Korah. - In the sixteenth chapter of Numbers, an account is given of a rebellion against the autocratic rule of Moses. The ring-leaders of the sedition were Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who were challenged to produce divine authority for their case by offering acceptable incense before the Lord. The punishment of the 250⁰ princes was destruction by a consuming fire "from the Lord" (cf. vs. 35). But for the three who prompted the challenge to Moses' authority, a more fearful punishment was reserved. Korah, Dathan, Abiram, their families, all that they had, were swallowed alive into the earth.¹ It is of particular interest in the investigation of conceptions of solidarity in the Old Testament, to note that the families and property were subjected to the same punishment as those who perpetrated the crime. In contrast with the families of the princes who apparently escaped any implication in the punishment of this group, the households of the leaders are so closely allied to them that they were required to share in their punishment. Here is a clear example of the strength of the bond of solidarity portrayed in the Old Testament. Even where there is no guilt (apparent) there can still be punishment and suffering of the consequences of the offence because of a relationship to the offending party.²

¹The article, "Korah," Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, ed. J. McClintock and J. Strong, Vol. V, 1891, notes that evidently not all of the family of Korah was destroyed since his sons are mentioned specifically in a later passage (Num. 26:11). The explanation is doubtless to be found in the suggestion that some of his sons may have been married and therefore were not part of the immediate family.

²G.B. Gray, The Divine Discipline of Israel, London, 1900, p. 78. This practice was indulged in the interest of precise retaliation, not the transference of guilt. Cf. D. Daube, Studies in Biblical Law, Cambridge, 1947, p. 169;

The application of this implication of the principle of solidarity must not be made too hastily, nor be expected universally. On the one hand we are tempted to conclude with H.W. Robinson that solidarity, "led to results which, from the modern view-point, are often startling, and even immoral,"¹ but on the other hand must not fail to note that the cases under discussion picture God as inflicting this guiltless corporate punishment. Actually, a re-examination of the passages in question will support H.H. Rowley's view that the Old Testament never depicts corporate punishment as vengeful but on the contrary as the expression of God's benevolence when the will of God operates through the natural consequences of human action.²

The alarming character of the idea of corporate punishment involving the undeserving, moreover, tends to draw attention out of proportion to its desert. Very nearly all the provisions of Old Testament law apply solely to individual responsibility.³ One passage will bear out this point:

And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbor; as he has done, so it shall be done to him: breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; ... ye shall have one manner of law as well for the sojourner as well as for the home-born: for I am Jehovah your God (Lev. 24:19,20,22; Cf. Deut. 24:16, "... every man shall be put to death for his own sin.").

Individual justice was applied in practice also. When a man desecrated the Sabbath by doing unlawful work, his punishment was administered individually

A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, Edinburgh, 1904, p. 219.

¹Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 87. Cf. G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, London, 1954, p. 24, and the concomitant idea in which one or a number which can render the community holy. D. Daube, op.cit., p. 160; A.B. Davidson, op.cit., p. 287.

²The Rediscovery of the Old Testament, London, 1945, p. 150.

³W. Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament, London, 1951, pp. 9-11. Eichrodt mentions the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20:23) as exemplifying this awareness of the individual.

(Num. 15:32-26). When Nadab and Abihu offered strange fire before the Lord, the principle of sole personal responsibility was applied (Lev. 10:1f.).¹ The application of individual justice greatly exceeds in number the cases involving corporate justice.

The case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, provides a possible solution to the intended purpose which underlies the infliction of corporate justice. The record states that the 250 princes were punished individually while the leaders were punished corporately. We have discussed above the psychic, almost indivisible unity of the Hebrew household presupposed in various conceptions which were held. It follows that the destruction of the family would be considered as a more severe sentence than an individual death penalty. The contention is made by A.R. Johnson that the personality (*שְׂרָפָה*) of a man extended to the whole of his house² just as it did to the members of his own body³ but with a diminishing intensity corresponding to the decreased awareness of unity. It may be put in this manner, The Hebrew conception of himself individually as a unity involved a stronger awareness of solidarity than of his household as a personal extension of his *שְׂרָפָה*. By the same token, the personality of the

¹Cf. G.E. Wright, op.cit., p. 24.

²The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, Cardiff, 1942, p. 8. Cf. G.A.F. Knight, op.cit., pp.33f.; Lévy-Bruhl, op.cit., p. 121.

³We quote from A.R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, op.cit., p. 39, "The conception of man as a psycho-physical organism may be seen equally clearly when one examines the use of the terminology for the various parts of the body..." According to H.W. Robinson, they are not merely instruments of the ego but are actively engaged in some form of personal behaviour or as characterized by some personal quality. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, Oxford, 1946, p. 70. A.R. Johnson is right in concluding that the sense of the totality of the individual is all-pervasive in Hebrew thought. It was vital energy which became evident in a specific organ which made it possible for the Hebrew to use a part of the body by synecdoche for a person as a whole. Cf. The Vitality of the Individual, op.cit., pp.82ff.; E.C. Rust, op.cit., pp. 114f. A more comprehensive discussion of the ancient Hebrew conception of the individual is found in Appendix A.

ancestor was sparsely diffused through his succeeding clan or tribe.

More modern ideas see no difficulty in accepting the principles of retribution propounded in the lex talionis (Lev. 24:17-21) because they assume that no punishment can be greater than the requirement of the payment ~~to~~ an individual life as a just recompense for any deed or series of deeds. To the Israelite, however, with his strong consciousness of the unity of the household, the requisition of an individual life is but one punishment in an ascending scale of degrees of severity, from the payment of a tooth for a tooth to the destruction of the whole family for an extremely serious offence. Thus the problem of corporate justice turns on the conception of the unity of the group coupled with an interest in precise retaliation for an offence. Such an understanding of Hebrew thought is essential if meaning is to be drawn from such exclamations as the mob made before Pilate regarding the consequences of the death of Jesus: "His blood be on us, and on our children" (Matt. 27:25). A statement of Jesus reveals an identical underlying conception:

"... That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation" (Luke 11:50f.).

Depending on the deed, a just recompense can then be extended far beyond the limits of the single individual to the family, a whole generation, or even to the whole world.¹

The sin and punishment of Achan. - The case of Achan, narrated in the seventh chapter of Joshua, is the classical example of the inclusion of the children in the punishment of the father. Achan's disobedience was the direct contradiction of the command of the Lord that nothing of the city of Jericho

¹Cf. M. Kadushin, Organic Thinking, New York, 1938, pp. 10f.

should be appropriated personally. The city and that which it contained was either דָּבָר "a devoted site," or קֹדֶשׁ "a holy thing." Achan's action was a violation of both of these distinctions. (cf. Josh. 6:18,19 with 7:21).¹ The direct consequences of the deed were the defeat of the contingent at Ai (7:5), the stoning of Achan, his family, and all of his property; everything there-upon was burned.² Again, the severity of the consequences of this action are bound inseparably with the principle of solidarity.³ H.W. Robinson views this case as no "... isolated incident of vindictive spite, but the deliberate application of a principle which nobody at the time thought of challenging, a principle represented as having the full approval of Yahweh."⁴ The sacred character of the commandment violated is throughout the passage viewed in the most serious terms. This provides further evidence for the contention already made that the death of Achan alone would not have answered for the crime which he had committed and that consequently, the rest of him, i.e. his family and

¹B.D.B., op.cit., p. 356, where the authors suggest that it (the דָּבָר) was a "thing hostile to theocracy, and therefore ... to be either destroyed, or, in the case of certain objects (e.g., silver and gold, vessels of brass and iron, Josh. 6:19,24), set apart to sacred uses." Cf. also the case of Agag, the king of Amalek and the spoil which are דָּבָר and for the violation of which Saul was rejected from being king (I Sam. 15).

²G.F. Maclear, The Book of Joshua, "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," ed. J.J.S. Perowne, Cambridge, 1904, p. 69, believes that the use of the singular (... all Israel stoned him) indicated that the children may not have suffered death at all and that the subsequent "them" refers only to the live-stock and property (vs. 25). The Jewish Encyclopedia points to the rabbinical literature on this passage which sees the children of Achan as only witnessing the execution. Ed. Isidore Singer, Vol. I, p. 164. The evidence, however, is almost totally against this view since the oscillation between the singular and the plural is one aspect of the Hebrew conception of corporate personality (cf. infra 160ff.). Furthermore, the same verse says that Israel burned them with fire, "after they had stoned them with stones."

³A.R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, op.cit., p. 6; cf. also W. Eichrodt op.cit., Vol. III, 110, and A.B. Davidson, op.cit., p. 220.

⁴The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 88.

property were also destroyed.¹ There is here no question of the guilt of the rest of the family although nothing can be said one way or another. Their inclusion in the punishment of the father² partakes of the same character as do the implicated members of the body in the death of the individual. They are appurtenances belonging to him in so intimate a way that they must be included.³

Particular cases where reference is made to the implication of generations beyond the second in the sin of their forefather are very rare. The fate pronounced by Elisha on Gehazi to extend "unto thy seed forever" (II Kings 5:27), is disputed by many as Hebrew hyperbole. In any case the

¹C.F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, trans. James Martin, Edinburgh, 1880, pp. 82, 83, come to very nearly the same conclusion: "Achan had fallen under the ban by laying hands upon what had been banned, and consequently was exposed to the same punishment as a town that had fallen away to idolatry (cf. Deut. 13:16, 17). The law of the ban was founded upon the assumption that the conduct to be punished was not a crime of which the individual only was guilty, but one in which the whole family of the leading sinner, in fact everything connected with him, participated."

²Pedersen says, "The extermination of great sinners is not punishment in the sense that the perpetrator of the deed has 'deserved' it according to the law of retaliation. It is not retaliation though the principle of retaliation may have acted as a secondary cause" (op.cit., I-II, 428). Closely allied to this was the notion of the "deed of blood." Again Pedersen comments, "If a deed of blood has been brought into the world (Josh. 2:19, II Sam. 1:16, I Kings 2:37), the deed persists as a wicked poison, consuming the soul of the man who has committed the deed of blood. And, according to the fundamental law of the soul, the guilt must spread from him and be carried by the whole of his family" (ibid., p. 420). Examples which bear out this representation are found in the cases of Abimelech (Judges 9) Ahab (cf. I Kings 21:17ff. with II Kings 9:26) where the sentence is commuted to Joram, his son, because Ahab repented before the Lord. Because of the deed of blood incurred by Joab in killing Abner (II Sam. 3:28ff.), David prompts Solomon to kill Joab (I Kings 2:30-34).

³J.B. Mozley, Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, 3rd ed., London, 1884. p. 89. D. Daube's study has shown that it "is only in consequence of the particular mode of punishment inflicted that, in physical fact, a third party is hurt," op.cit., p. 169). Cf. A.B. Davidson, op.cit., p. 219.

flexibility of the word דָּוָר indicates only an indefinite period extending into the future. It could in some cases mean no longer than the life span (cf. Deut. 15:17, Ex. 21:6, I Sam. 27:12).¹

National implication in the sin of an ancestor. - On a tribal or national scale, the situation is different. Particularly significant are those instances where the tribal or national ancestor is involved. Thus, in Genesis we read that Simeon and Levi (the tribes) are to be scattered in Israel for the cruelty of the patriarchs from whom they are derived (Gen. 49:5-7). The tribe of Reuben could never attain to stability because of the sin which Reuben had committed (Gen. 49:3,4). The exclusiveness of the blessing given to Jacob means that Edomites (the descendants of Esau) will be the servants of Israel (cf. Gen. 27:37 wi Mal. 1:3,4 and Ezek. 35:5,6). The ethnic Amalek is to be "utterly destroyed" because "he laid wait for him (Israel) in the way, when he came up from Egypt" (I Sam. 15:2,3). Israelites of Ezekiel's day were sure that they bore the sins of their fathers (chapter 16).² Jeremiah acknowledged the iniquity of Israel and "of our fathers" (Jer. 14:20). Canaan bears the unending curse of Noah because the original ancestor, Ham, had done evil on the occasion of Noah's drunkenness (Gen. 9:18ff.).

These cases in the Old Testament where the sins of the fathers are visited on the sons do not always involve the same issues as the suffering of the innocent children of the family. This difference is evidenced in the history of Levi. Because the tribe took its stand on "the Lord's side" to help Moses eradicate the idolatrous worship from Israel (Ex. 32:26-29), the sentence which had been pronounced against it because of the individual ancestor Levi (cf. Gen.

¹B. D. B., op. cit., pp. 761ff.

²J. Pedersen, op. cit., I-II, 436.

49:5-7), was altered from evil to good.¹ The scattering became the means by which the knowledge of the Lord was to be maintained in the nation (cf. Joshua 21:1-42) as well as bearing the burden of the details of the worship system.² Here, as in the individual case of Ahab (I Kings 21:17ff.), the inclusion in or exclusion from the guilt of the father is dependent on the persistence in or rejection of his ways. This emphasis is very clear in Ezekiel and Jeremiah where although the punishment of the nation has reference to the iniquity of the previous generations (cf. supra p. 23.), the particular reason for this punishment in their day is in consequence to their own wickedness. Amalek might continue for many generations, but the debt is finally paid, presumably at a time when its sinfulness was most odious. Jesus spoke of the blood of previous generations being required of Jews in His day because of the heinousness of their sin and because it was against so great light (cf. Matt. 11:20-24).

The latter passages besides implying the unity of the group, also emphasize the indivisibility of sin. Due to its contagious character, iniquity involves the interrelated members of a community. It is not barred by the line which separates generations. The sons often bear the punishment of their fathers because they follow in their footsteps. They bear the character type which pervades the life of the family. The Old Testament developed the idea through the observation of empirical phenomena awaiting the full theological development in the New Testament.

2. Blessing Extended to Later Generations:- The principle of corporate extension relates to more than corporate punishment. Corporate blessing or merit is the

¹Curiously, the biased author of the Book of Jubilees attributes the blessing of the priesthood to the tribe on account of Levi's part in exterminating the Shechemites (cf. 30:17,18).

²The respect with which the Levites are esteemed is indicated by the practical use made of them as Judges throughout all the fenced cities of Judah and Jerusalem by Jehoshaphat (II Chron. 19:5-11). A.B. Davidson speaks of the "bestowing inalienably the priesthood on that family," and the covenantal character of the Levitical priesthood. "Covenant," Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1898, p. 150.

positive side of the issue, involving an even more comprehensive coverage than punishment and demerit.¹ While Exodus 20:5 teaches that the vengeance of God on sin will extend to the fourth generation, His mercy includes thousands of generations in the reward of faithful observance of His commandments (Ex. 20:6). Some of the Old Testament examples of corporate blessing will bear out the truth of this declaration.

Although there is no evidence regarding the character of the family of Noah, the emphasis on his singular righteousness and its consequent reward suggests that it was because of their solidarity with him that they were saved (Gen. 6:7). In the record of the preservation of the family of Lot, the unity of the family offers the explanation for the exemption of the group from the destruction of Sodom (Gen. 19:1-28).² Subsequent behaviour of Lot's wife (Gen. 19:26), as well as that of his daughters (Gen. 19:31-38), suggests that their salvation was not consequent upon their own righteousness. It was Solomon's good fortune that he had king David for a father as we find in I Kings 11:11:

For as much as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee ... Notwithstanding in thy days I will not do it for David thy father's sake ...

A further concession in the retention of the one tribe (Judah) as a kingdom is

¹Cf. L. Köhler, p. 149.

²Although the intercession of Abraham for the cities of the plain does not properly belong under the title of this section, the basis of Abraham's plea is relevant to this discussion. His presupposition is that the towns are indivisible units. He invites corporate justice in blessing rather than the expected corporate punishment which would have rightly destroyed the few righteous with the many wicked. On this point we may quote from Marcus Dods: "It is remarkable that throughout, it is for justice that Abraham pleads, and for justice of a limited and imperfect kind. He proceeds on the assumption that the town will be judged as a town, and either wholly saved or wholly destroyed. He has no idea of individual discrimination being made, those only suffering who had sinned." Marcus Dods and others, An Exposition of the Bible, Vol. I, Hartford, Conn., 1903, p. 50.

made to Rehoboam in regard for the merit of David (I Kings 11:13).¹ In the same manner, Abijam came under the canopy of David's corporate blessing although he was himself a wicked king: "Nevertheless for David's sake did the Lord his God give him a lamp in Jerusalem, to set up his son after him, and to establish Jerusalem ..." (I Kings 15:4). Jerusalem as a city was preserved from the attack of Sennacherib and the mighty Assyrian army for the sake of David, the servant of God (II Kings 19:34).²

Still greater periods of time are involved in the corporate blessing of Abraham. In the covenant which God made with this patriarch a strong emphasis is placed on the conception of transferred merit.³ Because of his obedience and faith, not only were his progeny to enjoy greatness in numbers and strength, so that they might possess the land of Palestine, but all the families of the earth would also share in his blessing (Gen. 12:1ff. 15:5ff. 17:1ff.).

The possibility of transferred blessing was frequently made the basis of intercession. If Israel had sinned, God's remembering Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was an urgent cause why He should show leniency in judgment for their sakes (Ex. 32:13).⁴ The very election of the nation of Israel to be the people of God rested on the original call of righteous Abraham (cf. Gen. 12:2). On such an occasion as the election might be endangered through Israel's idolatry or sin, forgiveness was sought on the basis of the original promise to Abraham. Thus, in the Hebrew conception, the divine dealings with the nation are mediated

¹S.A. Cook, The Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., p. 439.

²Cf. L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 242, no. 125.

³By "transference," the idea of inclusion and relationship is to be understood rather than the more modern conception of imputation. The idea of a measurable quantity of merit, popularized in Roman Catholic theology, is completely foreign to ancient Hebrew thinking.

⁴S.A. Cook, The Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., p. 539.

through its ancestor, for good or for evil.¹ There were modifying factors, to be sure, as Israel had to learn, but the grace of God shown to the patriarch invariably implicated His dealings with his descendants.

Times of national stress and difficulty tended to convince later generations that the principle of transferred blessing was no longer of any great consequence. This inference may be drawn from such passages as Ezekiel 14:14,20, where there is no evidence that the people thought the righteousness of a Noah, Daniel or Job would actually alleviate or commute their deserved punishment. Rather, says the prophet, even if "these men were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither sons nor daughters; they only shall be delivered ..." (vs. 16). No longer is mention made of the gracious remembrance of the fathers of the nation. Later Jewish writers made a great deal of the benefit of the merit of the ancestors (see infra: ch. 2) but the conception had its roots in the idea of the corporate unity of the nation with its ancestor(s), a conception evinced in the Old Testament.²

3. The Implications of Corporate Extension in the Covenant:- The symbol and medium of the Old Testament conception of the corporate unity of the nation was the covenant. A covenant between men or tribes bolstered a corporate unity as W.R. Smith has said: "A covenant means artificial brotherhood, and has no place where the natural brotherhood of which it is an imitation already subsists."³ This statement must be modified in the light of our previous discussion. In the case of Israel, the Covenant served as an external frame within which the generic unity of the nation subsisted. This understanding made it possible for Israel

¹Cf. H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 151.

²C.G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology, London, 1938, p. c.

³Religion of the Semites, op.cit., p. 318; Cf. J. Pedersen, op.cit., I-II, 285.

to maintain both an inclusivism, through the admission of foreigners which were incorporated into the covenant, and an exclusivism, which the laws of the covenant rigorously maintained.

The basic meaning of ברית is "pact," or "compact." It is used to refer to contracts between men as well as between God and men.¹ It is the latter usage which primarily concerns us in this section. Its derivation from בר "to cut," is maintained by Cremer,² but is unrecognized by Brown, Driver, and Briggs.³ These lexicographers and Quell in the Theologisches Worterbuch prefer to relate ברית to the Assyrian baru, beritu, "bind," "bond."⁴ The emphasis of the Old Testament idea of the covenant is one of relationship. The accompanying promises are the visible signs. Thus it became used primarily of the covenant between God and Israel as Cremer notes:

In a word, we must affirm that ברית , as a term. techn., signifies primarily the covenant relation in which God has entered, or will enter, with Israel, then the relation into which Israel enters with God (cf. Jer. 22:9 with Ex. 23:32, Jer. 34:18); and, correspondingly, next, the two-fold and mutual relationship; thus, finally, the stipulations or promises which are given as signs, which set forth and embody the covenant, in which the covenant is expressed.⁵

It is the covenant which is presumed by the history and religion of Israel - a covenant which has bound the nation into a unity and has given continuity to its life. This it could do because it was made with the nation as a unity, not with individuals.⁶ Nor was it necessary to restate the terms of the covenant to

¹B.D.B., op.cit., p. 136; J.O. Cobham, "Covenant," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. A. Richardson, London, 1950, p. 55.

²Lexicon of New Testament Greek, tr. by W. Urwick, 3rd Eng. Ed., Edinburgh, 1880, p. 549. Cf. the division of sacrificial victims in the covenant institution in Gen. 15:9-18.

³Op.cit., p. 136.

⁴T.W.N.T., II, 107f.

⁵H. Cremer, op.cit., p. 551.

⁶A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 241. This point is equally applicable to the Davidic Covenant (II Sam. 7:13,16; 23:5), the

succeeding generations because of the national solidarity uniting Abraham and the Israelites of the Exodus. A. Büchler has pointed out this feature in the three normative passages relating to the covenant (i.e. Gen. 17:14, Deut. 31:16, 20, and Jer. 11:10, 31:33):

All the three passages take it for granted that the covenant made by God with Israel at Sinai continued to be binding throughout the centuries, though not renewed; and the same is stated explicitly in Gen. 17:9,12, when God imposed circumcision upon Abraham and his descendants throughout their generations expressly as an everlasting covenant (vs. 13), and so also the Sabbath in Exodus 31:16, 'to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant.'¹

L. Köhler speaks of the People of Israel in the conception of the covenant, as "above time, timeless."²

Through the covenant, the eternity and immutability of God were aligned directly with the nation of Israel. Because He is a party to the contract, the continuity of the nation is guaranteed.³ Thus, when the prophets speak of the righteousness of Jehovah and consider that it implies that He will save His people, they speak within the frame-reference of the covenant. But since they have broken their side of the contract, appeal is really made to the nature of God. "Remember the covenant," is "Remember the past, the old relationship - that with Abraham."⁴ Although it was through Abraham that the original covenant

Levitic Covenant (cf. Num. 18:6) and the Abrahamic (Gen. 17:19), the three factors of Israel's religious history. Cf. A.B. Davidson, "Covenant", Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. I., Edinburgh, 1898, p. 511. Along this line, S. Hanson speaks appropriately, "Thus it was the people that were the partner of the covenant, and the covenant applied to the individual only in so far as he was a member of God's people." The Unity of the Church in the New Testament, Uppsala, 1946, pp. 11f. Cf. F.W. Dillistone, The Structure of the Divine Society, London, 1951, pp. 31-46.

¹Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century, London, 1928, p. 10.

²Op. cit., p. 48.

³Ibid., pp. 43ff.

⁴A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, op. cit., p. 241.

was made (cf. Gen. 15:12ff.), its specific provisions have actual application to his seed to which God had "given this land" (vs. 18). Therefore, it was through the covenant that the immutable God was united to Abraham, and through him to the nation, and through them to the land (cf. Ex. 6:4,7f.). Thus, there is a strict injunction found in Leviticus against giving up the land: "The land shall not be for cutting off (lit. Heb.), for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (25:23, Cf. Num. 36:7,8 where a similar law restricts the transference of the land allotted to each tribe).¹

There are other implications besides the continuity of the nation involved in the covenant. H.W. Robinson has pointed out the fundamental significance of the covenant for the unity of the People of God. "It is characteristic of the genius and eventual contribution of Israel that its national unity was from the outset based on religion."² This unity was derived from the recognition that Israel was the chosen people, linked to Him by no quasi-physical tie such as that of a nature-god, but a moral act.³ This 𐤇𐤍𐤅 "mercy, lovingkindness," shown in God's initiation of the covenant relationship⁴ was the basis of

¹W.R. Smith expresses the view of contemporary Semitic peoples, in which a god would be bound up with his people and even with the land they occupied; people, god, and land formed one inseparable unity. To change one's god would be equivalent to changing one's nationality, op.cit., p.36. The conception in one form or another may have influenced Israel as W.D. Davies says, "In this paradoxical nationalism in their (Israel's) religion we can clearly trace, the survival of the primitive conception of the solidarity of a god and his people ... The idea that Israel should be one explains why throughout the Old Testament and in the Pseudepigrapha the disruption of the kingdom was regarded with such horror; the division was a denial of that oneness which should characterize the people of Yahweh." Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1948, pp. 79f.

²H.W. Robinson, "The Group and the Individual in Israel," op.cit., p. 159. Cf. A.C. Welch, Post-exilic Judaism, Edinburgh and London, 1935, pp. 1,9,10; R.L. Hicks, "The Jewish Background of the New Testament Doctrine of the Church," A.T.R., Vol. 30, 1948, p. 109; W.A. Irwin, "The Hebrews," op.cit., p. 328.

³H.W. Robinson, "The Group and the Individual in Israel," op.cit.; Cf. C.H. Patterson, op.cit., p. 86.

⁴Cf. Amos 7:20, Deut. 7:9,12, I Kings 8:23; B.D.B., op.cit., p. 339.

benevolent figures designed to describe it. Thus the covenantal relationship is analogous to adoption and Israel may be called the son of God (Hos. 11:1. Cf. supra p.5.). Israel's apostasy was a direct violation of the terms of the covenant; hence, the nation is described as an adulterous wife (cf. Ezek. 23).¹ In Deuteronomy 32:6,18, God is the Father Who at once bought, formed (i.e. created) and begat Israel.² The preferred position of Israel is compared to the "firstborn" (Ex. 4:22). Through the promises of the covenant which is Israel's birth-right, she will enjoy the benefits embodied in the promises (Deut. 28:1-14).

Although from one point of view, the emphasis on the covenant made Israel exclusive, the contract itself provided for the inclusion of the גֵּר "resident alien," within its folds.³ The distinctive sign or token of the covenant was circumcision (Gen. 17: cf. Rom. 4:11).⁴ Because it was closely akin to an initiatory ceremony, "... it naturally came to be interpreted in a wider sense as an act of admission to a group."⁵ Therefore the law read, "When a גֵּר shall יָשָׁב "reside" with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he

¹Cf. J. Bright, The Kingdom of God, New York, 1953, p. 74.

²See G. A. Barton, "The Kinship of Gods and Men Among the Early Semites," J.B.L., XV, 1896, pp. 168ff. for parallels in Semitic ideas. Note Jer. 2:27,28, where mention is made that idolatrous people claim descent (i.e. filial relationship) to trees and stones. Ibid., p. 171.

³Cf. W. A. Irwin, The Old Testament: The Keystone of Human Culture, New York, 1952, pp. 194f.; A. Lods, "Les Antécédents de la Notion d'Eglise en Israël, Origine et Nature de l'Eglise en Israël, Paris, 1939, pp. 24ff.; L. Köhler notes that "no man of the Old Testament is without a people (volkslos)." op.cit., p. 115.

⁴A. B. Davidson, "Covenant," op.cit., p. 511.

⁵A. Lods, Israel ..., op.cit., p. 198.

shall be as one that is born in the land: for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof" (Ex. 12:48).¹ The passover was Israel's distinctive national celebration. For an alien to partake of that feast meant that he realistically included himself in the redemption from Egypt, the foundation of Israel's national existence.

So prominent is the feature of union rather than descent in the original constitution of the nation that K. Mohlenbrink, is unwilling that we should use the term 'people' for the group created or led by Moses, nor for that matter a state or a race. According to this author, Israel never formed a genuine people, but an exclusively religious alliance, an amphictyony.² In the sense of אֶלֶף , the group under Moses was a people, as A. Lods points out: "The אֶלֶף to begin with, is a group of men who are descended, or believe themselves descended, from a common ancestor."³ While this description would fit the majority of the Israelites in the wilderness wandering, the fact that it was a "mixed multitude" which came up out of Egypt requires a somewhat broader meaning for אֶלֶף . Brown, Driver, and Briggs concur by stating that the probable original meaning of אֶלֶף is "those united, connected, or

¹It is of value for comparison to note that the Arab tribesmen, when admitting an alien resident, solemnized the act of initiation by an oath (casama). It was a religious act and "... almost certainly implies that there was a reference to the god at the sanctuary before the alliance was sealed, and that he was made a party to the act." W.R. Smith, Kinship and Marriage, op.cit., p. 48.

²Noted by A. Lods, "Origins of the Religion of Israel," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, Oxford, 1938, p. 204, from Die Entstehung des Judentums, Hamburg, 1936, pp. 17f. Cf. W.F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, Baltimore, 1942, pp. 99-103; G.E. Wright, The Old Testament Against its Environment, Chicago, 1950, p. 61; W.A. Irwing, "The Hebrews," op.cit., p. 328; J. Bright, op.cit., p. 31; T.H. Gaster, Passover: its History and Traditions, New York, 1949, pp. 31f.

³Israel ..., op.cit., p. 204. So also S.A. Cook, "Yahweh's dealings with and promises to the patriarchs ensure the welfare of those who regard themselves as their descendants..." The Old Testament: a Re-interpretation, op.cit. p. 118.

related."¹

As a matter of historical fact, the corporate unity of the nation was not seriously impaired by the inability to prove natural descent from the national ancestor(s).² The covenant provided the uniting bond which welded the alien and pedegreed Israelite into one.³ Thus S.A. Cook is right in suggesting that although blood-relationship might seem the more basic and powerful in producing corporate unity, "... The psychical factors are clearly not less powerful than the physiological, and it is convenient to regard all group-units psychologically as systems, the social group of kinsfolk being the most elemental."⁴ This contention is well illustrated in Leviticus 25:35ff. where the גֵּר and the אֲדָמִי "sojourner" are termed "thy brother." Presumably the distinctions between the זָר "foreigner" and the "brother" in Deuteronomy 15:3 and elsewhere, involve a distinction in the intention of the alien, for he may be treated differently from the homeborn, in the matter of debt payment after the Sabbath year.

Fundamental to the union of the alien and son of Abraham, was the covenant which related a man to his neighbor and God to the whole. Pedersen has emphasized this point well:

This denotes the psychic communion and the common purpose which

¹Op.cit., p. 766, Cf. G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., p. 78. This meaning is especially important to the recognition of Israel's self-consciousness as the people of Yahweh. See M. Noth, Geschichte Israels, Göttingen, 1950, pp.1-7.

²W.A. Irwin claims that it was a question of loyalty which was involved. The Old Testament: Keystone of Human Culture, pp. 189ff. From the Religion of the Semites, we quote W.R. Smith, "There is in fact, what may be called a psychical bond, which can be superior to physical kinship; ... Kinship was not necessarily a matter of birth, it could be acquired." op.cit., p. 273.

³W. Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, Vol. I, Leipzig, 1933, p. 8.

⁴S.A. Cook, "Notes appended to W.R. Smith, The Religion of the Semites," op.cit., p. 506, Cf. A. Lods, "Les Antecedents de la Notion d'Eglise," op.cit., p. 12.

united the people and its God. It is also expressed by saying that the peace of Yahweh reigns in Israel (Jer. 16:5); therefore, the relation between them is characterized by love, the feeling of fellowship among kinsmen.¹

Many of the laws of the Pentateuch were designed to maintain this feeling of brotherhood throughout the varied elements of the Israelite community. Thus Jesus correctly put the Shema (Deut. 6:4,5) and the Golden Rule of the Old Testament (Lev. 19:18) together, and commended the scribe for discovering the sum of the Torah in them (Mark 12:30ff.).

Through the initiatory ceremony of circumcision,² the partaking of Pesach,³ the observation of the law, and the renunciation of pagan worship, the became a "child of the covenant."⁴ He was not a convert in the sense that proselytes were in later Judaism. It was not so much a change of religion as a complete change of nationality. In a real sense the "resident alien" per-

¹J. Pedersen, III-IV, op.cit., p. 612. Cf. L. Kohler, op.cit., p. 172; G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, pp. 48,82.

²See E.O. James, "Initiatory Rituals," in Myth and Ritual, ed. S.H. Hooke, Oxford, 1933, pp. 147ff. He claims that in such societies where a corporate attitude of mind prevails, an initiation into tribal society is required, as distinct from that of the family in which he is born. Ibid., p. 150. Cf. A. Lods, Israel, op.cit., p. 198.

³In the Pesach celebration, there may be involved a conception of the unity which pervades the group through a common meal. A covenant meal produced a bond of a more or less psychic nature which one did not dare violate. Note that Jacob invited his erstwhile enemy Laban to "eat bread" as a final assurance that their covenant would remain unbroken (Gen. 31:54). Cf. L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 172. Further examples to support this point, would include the treaty which Melchizedek contracted with Abraham by proffering bread and wine (Gen. 14:18-24). The covenant contracted for Israel with the Gibeonites by the princes was solemnized through partaking of Gibeonite food (Josh. 9:14). Obadiah uses "men of thy confederacy" and "men of thy bread" as parallel expressions. T.H. Gaster, Passover: its History and Traditions, op.cit., p. 18. A fuller discussion may be consulted in W.T. McCree, "The Covenant Meal in the Old Testament," J.B.L., XLV, 1926, pp. 120ff. "He that eats with another has God present as a third guest and, in a mysterious way, he and that other have actually a part of God within them," concludes this author (p. 128). Israel was expressly enjoined not to make a covenant with the Canaanites lest she be persuaded to worship heathen gods and partake of heathen sacrifices (Ex. 34:15). L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 172.

⁴C.R. Smith, op.cit., p. 260.

formed Jewish ritual because of imposition,¹ in that he had joined a theocratic society in which no deviation was tolerated. It was in this realm that Israel's mission to the nations lay. God was the creator and ruler of the whole earth. The ideal was the incorporation of the whole world into the domain of the covenant which was the Kingdom of God. The failure of Israel to capitalize on its mission to the nations,² proved to the prophets of the classical period that the old covenant was temporary. The message of Isaiah and Micah pointed to a future establishment of an everlasting covenant which would re-unite David, the king, and the people under God (Isa. 55:3ff.).³ Because of the wickedness of Israel's kings, the breaking of the old covenant, and the consequent punishment of the nation, the future must hold the radical re-introduction of the ideal embodied in the covenant of David.⁴ This involved the mission of the Servant of the Lord which would extend in influence to the whole world.⁵ "... Nations which knew not thee shall run unto thee because of the Lord thy God" (Isa. 55:5; cf. Micah 4:2f.). In Isaiah 42:6f., the Servant is designated as אֲנִי יְהוָה. The scope of this new covenant extends beyond the national boundaries of Israel - a pledge of mercy on God's part to all mankind.⁶ We may not necessarily agree with C.R. North that the phrase refers originally to Israel and subsequently

¹Cf. M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, New York, 1952, p. 99.

²Cf. G.A.F. Knight, op.cit., p. 184.

³J. Pedersen, III-IV, op.cit., p. 94.

⁴Ibid., p. 95.

⁵H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," Reprint from B.J.R.L., Vol. 33, 1, Sept. 1950, p. 105.

⁶Cf. C.C. Torrey, The Second Isaiah, Edinburgh, 1928, pp.113,327f. On the universalism of the prophet, See pp. 111ff.

to the individual Servant, but the extent of the covenant is clear.¹ It is of the utmost significance that the Old Testament should refer to a person (corporate?) as a covenant. The importance is seen in the New Testament doctrine of the New Covenant mediated by Christ.

This brief discussion is completely inadequate to show how fundamental the covenant is in the Old Testament. W. Eichrodt has made it the interpretative basis of the Hebrew Scriptures, in his Theologie des Alten Testaments.² Unity of race and continuity of history were Israel's through the covenant. The benevolent relationship between God and the Nation was everlasting, equivalent to sonship (Isa. 63:16, 64:8),³ or marriage.⁴ Beyond unity and continuity the solidarity of the nation was strongly intimated. No individual was a recipient of the benefits of the covenant except as a member of the nation.⁵ Indeed, the Old Testament conception of the covenant is inseparably linked to the conception of corporate personality.⁶ Says A. Lods to this effect:

But the principle (of corporate personality) applies widely in other less recognizable realms, as well as in the standing example of the

¹See C.R. North's careful discussion of the difficulties encountered in this passage, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, London, 1948, pp. 131ff. We will treat this reference at greater length infra.

²Cf. H.W. Robinson, Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 55.

³Cf. A.B. Davidson, "Covenant," op.cit., 511. Cf. Lev. 24:8 with Jer. 33:20f.

⁴C. Chavasse, The Bride of Christ, London, 1940, p. 23. in Hosea's prophecy the idea gains full development. It serves the purpose of revelation well, for the nexus of the people with God was national and corporate (ibid., 29) and at the same time showed the continuity of the relationship of the "Choosing God" to the "Chosen People" irrespective of the passage of successive generations. The immutability of the covenant despite the repeated and prolonged unfaithfulness of Israel, the Wife, is the theme of Isaiah's declaration (61:10, 62:45). (Ibid., pp. 133ff.). The "divorce" so movingly declared by Hosea was but a temporary estrangement (Isa. 50:1). Cf. J. Bright, op.cit., 141.

⁵H.W. Robinson, "The Group and the Individual in Israel," op.cit., p. 160. Cf. Wm. Robinson, The Biblical Doctrine of the Church, St. Louis, 1948, p. 30.

⁶H.W. Robinson, Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 55.

covenant between Yahweh and Israel as a people. It makes a unit of Israelites, past, present and future (cf. Ex. 20:5,6), and gives to the individual Israelite a group consciousness which has no real parallel in modern conceptions.¹

Strictly speaking, the covenant is not merely an implication of the continuous extension of the personality of the group. It is to a great extent the basis for this extension. It forms an immutable moral tie between the unchanging God and Israel. All the members of a covenantal community are subordinate to the whole. To sever oneself from the group is to be cut off from the covenant.

The Aspect of Realism

Caution must be taken, warns H.W. Robinson, that the evidence of solidarity in the Old Testament be not considered figuratively. It is a true realism — belonging to the realm of anthropology and archaeology rather than to philology.² It is extremely difficult to determine with assurance what is figurative speech and what is Semitic realism; hence, the evidence must be weighed carefully. The first essential is the adoption of an ancient Semitic mental frame of reference; from this vantage point the possibility of a correct evaluation of many statements in the Old Testament will be greatly increased.

First of all it must be recognized that the Israelite thinks in universals rather than atomistically.³ He seizes the essence, then subordinates the

¹A. Lods, "Origins of the Religion of Israel," op.cit., p. 332.

²H.W. Robinson, Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 51.

³This manner of thinking was not a conscious attempt to solve the fundamental problem of metaphysics regarding the final nature of things, but an orientation of life. Pedersen's famous description of the Hebrew mind as a "grasping of a totality" is so characteristic that A.R. Johnson says, "It is, perhaps, hardly too much to say that it is the 'open sesame' which unlocks the secrets of the Hebrew language and reveals the riches of the Israelite mind." The Vitality of the Individual in the Life of Ancient Israel, op.cit., pp. 7f. It is an open question whether the monotheism which is fundamental in Judaism had any influence

details to it. Pedersen says in a point of clarification:

If, for instance, he calls up the image of a Moabite, then it is not an individual person with a number of individual qualities, which also include the fact of his coming from Moab. The features which make the specially Moabitic character, create a type which is the sum and substance of Moabitic features, ... The individual Moabite, mo'abhi, is a manifestation of it.¹

Thus, it was possible for the whole to be embodied in one or a group of its parts. An oscillation between the group seen as an individual or vice versa is therefore not an isolated phenomenon in ancient semitic writings.

Unification is instinctive to the Hebrew mind.² Examples are to be found in all areas of life. The Hebrew language is an excellent area for illustrative purposes. It is full of "general or totality denomination or denominations of species," which reveal themselves in the individual or individuals in view.³ Thus, for example עֵץ, which carries the idea of "tree," may stand equally well for a single tree or a forest (cf. Gen. 3:3 with Ps. 74:5).⁴

אָדָם may signify either a man (Gen. 2:5ff.) or mankind (II Sam. 7:19, Jer. 21:6, 31:27, 50:3).⁵ צָבָא stands for chariotry (II Kings 13:7, Ex. 14:7)

on the monistic frame of reference. In any case as Hanson says, "We find no human society not having in some way conquered chaos. Such subjugation of chaos is the fundamental basis of culture." The Unity of the Church in the New Testament, Uppsala, 1946, p. 3.

¹I-II, op.cit., p. 109.

²H.W. Robinson, Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 51. Along this line MacIver says of the primitive mind: "To the primitive man the group is all. He finds himself in a group, but he never finds himself. He is not a personality, but one of the bearers of a type personality. He is summed up in the group, the clan or the tribe." Community, London, 1917, p. 332. Cf. L. Kbhler, op.cit., p. 149.

³J. Pedersen, I-II, op.cit., p. 110.

⁴Cf. B.D.B., op.cit., p. 781, for more examples.

⁵Ibid., p. 9. Cf. C. Lattey, op.cit., p. 269; L. Kbhler, op.cit., p. 113. The ambiguity is strikingly attested in Deut. 4:32, where it is impossible to determine whether it is a singular or generic mankind "that God created on the earth." To the Hebrew mind, the problem was non-existent, since they ^{are} equivalent or compenetrative ideas.

or for a single chariot (I Kings 22:35,38).¹ Another illustration of the same principle is the use of the derivative ending to designate the individual (e.g. נִיחָן, נִיחָן) "which implies that the individual is that which is derived."² On this basis, no Platonic abstraction was necessary for the Hebrew to see a potential unity existing between the whole and any of its parts.³ The part was a manifestation of the original totality, the essence of which was diffused through the part.

1. The Conception of the Totality of Life. - The realistic conception of universal totalities is of interest to us because it is evident in the Hebrew conception of society. In this category belongs the idea of a totality of life (נִיחָן, נִיחָן). When one's life is to be preserved it is rolled up "in the bundle of life" (I Sam. 25:39; cf. Gen. 44:30). For this reason Zedekiah admitted that taking away the life of Jeremiah was to rob him "of something which he shares with his fellows as a gift from Yahweh 'who hath made for us this life' (נִיחָן, Jer. 38:16)."⁴ A common life or נִיחָן, "soul," in a group is frequently alluded to in the Old Testament. Thus for example, "... the soul of thy wives" (II. Sam. 19:6, Heb.), or the "... the soul of thy enemies" (I Kings 3:11, Heb.), properly expresses the conception of the unity which pervades the psychic group (cf. Isa. 3:9, 42:2; Heb.; Jer. 31:14, 17:21, Heb.; II Chron. 1:11, Heb.).⁵

¹B.D.B., op.cit., p. 939. Many more illustrations of the point in question might be presented, but those cited will suffice to maintain the contention.

²J. Pedersen, I-II, op.cit., p. 110. Cf. C. Lattey, op.cit., p. 269; G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., p. 50.

³A.R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual, op.cit., p. 8.

⁴Ibid., p. 13. Cf. L. Köhler, op.cit., pp. 129f.

⁵L. Köhler, p. 148. F.W. Dillistone finds in the Israelite consciousness of a common life the reason for the reluctance of the Community to accept monarchical rulership. It was foreign to the genius of Hebrew social order. The Structure of the Divine Society, London, 1951. p. 26.

The term חַיָּוִת "the life," is used as a parallel expression to "all men" and is a precise synonym in Ecclesiastes 7:2. The idea of a community of life may explain the origin of the term חַיָּוִת "animal, living thing,"¹ to distinguish the animate from the inanimate. This totality is vitalized through the breath of God (cf. Gen. 2:7), which the flesh, composed of עָפָר "dust," needs for its animation (cf. Ezek. 37:8ff.).²

Co-terminal with the universal unit of life is the totality of בָּשָׂר "flesh." It is also a totality of which any single species such as that of men, birds, or animals is but a manifestation. Therefore Noah takes into the ark two by two from amongst all the creatures, "of all flesh" (Gen. 7:15,16; cf. 9:15ff., Lev. 17:14, Num. 18:15). The horses of Egypt are composed of flesh (Isa. 31:3) as are the forces (men and cavalry) of Assyria which are described as one of its arms (II Chron. 32:8).³ "Flesh," is frequently used to denote mankind (cf. Gen. 6:12f. Num. 16:32; Deut. 5:23, Ps. 65:3; Isa. 66:16,23,24, etc.). But it must be noted as J.A.T. Robinson has argued that, "The flesh-body was not what partitioned a man off from his neighbor; it was rather what bound him in the bundle of life with all men and nature."⁴ Therefore, God is the God of the "spirits of all flesh" (Num. 27:16), with the emphasis on the individuation of the נַפְשׁוֹת , not the totality of בָּשָׂר .

2. The Conception of Unity of Purpose or Counsel. - Because the Israelite placed no value on theoretical thinking, the action and its result were not dis-

¹B.D.B., op.cit., p. 312.

²Cf. E.C. Rust, op.cit., p. 97. This author concludes that the difference between Adam and the beasts is the direct in-breathing of the ruach of God into Adam. All the rest of creation shares in His general ruach which blows throughout the whole creation and is given to each living thing collectively. Man with the ability to abstract himself from mankind is treated as an ego not a min, op.cit., p. 99.

³Cf. W. Eichrodt, II, 74.

⁴The Bbdy, London, 1952. p. 15

tinguished from the mental processes which preceded them. J. Pedersen attributes this to the fact that, "the soul is present in all of its works. The actions are not sent away from the soul, they are the outer manifestations of the whole of the soul, the traces of its movements; its 'ways' the Hebrew calls them."¹ When the Children of Israel gather "together as one man" (Judg. 20:1; cf. vs. 8) a unity of purpose is in view. This counsel is embodied in the souls of the troops, but is manifested in their action, i.e., rising up (vs. 8) and laying siege to the city (vs. 11). Similarly, the Danites ask Micah, "What aileth thee that thou art gathered together."² The unity of counsel is exemplified in the leader of the host. Jehu asks his men, "If it be your minds (וְכָל־לְבָבְכֶם) then let none go forth nor escape out of the city ..." (II Kings 9:15). A.R. Johnson clarifies this idea:

To the Israelite, however, such unity of purpose thus manifested in a group of people is simply evidence of a corporate personality rather than that of a mere individual, and so may be indicated with equal justification by the simple term " וְכָל־לְבָבְכֶם ".³

As counsel is the expression of the soul, unity of counsel in the nation, is the manifestation of the life of the nation (cf. II Sam. 19:14,15). In the same way, the soul of the nation is shortened (i.e. discouraged) and loathes the manna. The expression denotes the unity or the universal attitude of the people as well as its corporate personality evidenced in the use of the singular וְכָל־לְבָבְכֶם (Num 21:4,5).

3. The Conception of a Corporate Heart. - The Old Testament frequently attributes to the nation a single heart. It may be perfect with Jehovah God (I Kings

¹I-II, 128.

²Judges 18:23 R.V. margin. Cf. S.A. Cook, Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., p. 493.

³The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, op.cit., p. 19.

8:61) or be broken (Num. 32:7, Heb.; cf. further Deut. 11:16, Josh. 14:8, I Sam. 6:6, Heb., Gen. 18:5, 42:28, Ex. 35:29). The very frequent references to the heart of Israel (in the singular) are obviously metaphorical. The term "heart" refers to the mind (cf. infra Appendix A). It is therefore Israel's one mind that is signified by this expression.¹

4. The Realistic Representation of the National Ruler. - As the individual manifestation or member of the group bears the life of the group in himself, a prominent member may incorporate the essence of the group. The manner in which representation in the Old Testament is depicted, throws light on that important "individual who gathers to himself the force of the whole group."² The most vivid example of realistic representation in the Old Testament, is the conception of the king as identified with his kingdom.³ Thus, the prince of Tyre is addressed in the dirge of Ezekiel 28, but the city is included in his destruction (cf. vvs. 7ff.). It is the precise embodiment of Israel by David that provides the grounds for Joab's retort, "Why will he (David) be^a cause of trespass to Israel" (I Chron. 21:3). Israel's responsibility for David's sin in numbering the people cannot be more than the fact that David is acting for them in a realistic way in lieu of the point that no part of the nation had any actual

¹Cf. W.A. Irwin, "The Hebrews," op.cit., p. 277.

²H.W. Robinson, Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 55. Note Ex. 18:17-19, where the health and welfare of Moses is identified with the health and welfare of the Children of Israel, whom he leads. Cf. the analysis of the Arab in T.E. Lawrence, "Among the Arabs there were no distinctions, traditional or natural, except the unconscious power given a famous sheikh by virtue of his accomplishment." The Seven Pillars of Wisdom, London, 1935, p. 157. On p. 39 the Arabians are termed the race of the individual genius.

³Cf. N.A. Dahl, Das Volk Gottes, Oslo, 1941, pp. 20ff. He characterizes the Hebrew conception of the King as, "... die Verkörperung des Volkes ist, der alle Kräfte des Volkstrums in sich zusammenfasst." Ibid., p. 21. There is a parallel conception of the Roman emperor as analyzed by C.N. Cochrane's Christianity and Classical Culture, Oxford, 1940, p. 127: "... To repeat the words of Cicero, 'He carried the person of the state.' In this sense he emerged as the supreme embodiment of Roman virtue, speaking and acting not merely for but also as the sovereign people whom he professed to 'represent.'"

part in the decision.¹ It is therefore not primarily a question of the personal guilt of those who perished in the pestilence, but the proximity of the relationship of the people to the king. His sinning implicates them in his own punishment. This same corporate unity is evidenced in the warning of God to Abimelech concerning the appropriation of Sarah as his wife: "And if thou restore her not, know thou that thou shalt surely die, thou and all that are thine (Gen. 20:7). In Abimelech's chiding of Abraham, there is an acknowledgement of the corporate character of the sin which he was about to commit, for it would not have been upon him alone, but also upon his whole kingdom (Gen. 20:9).²

The manifestation of the life of Israel in David is depicted figuratively in the use of the term נֵר "lamp"³ (II Sam. 21:17; cf. Ps. 132:17f.), which would be extinguished in the event of his death (cf. 18:6, Ex. 18:17f., where the "fading" of Moses, implies the fading of the people, i.e. Israel). A passage

¹David argues in his prayer against this inclusion of the innocent in his own punishment and declaims any responsibility on their part. Rather, he desires that the penalty should fall upon him and his father's house, the latter being more obviously a part of himself, than the nation. D. Daube notes that in the case of David and the pestilence, God meant to punish David alone. He had boasted of the number, so the number was diminished. David is considered the owner and the people, his "possessions." They are innocent sheep, which makes this a case of individual responsibility, not communal. It is the punishment that is peculiar. Studies in Biblical Law, Cambridge, 1947, pp. 162f.

²It is altogether possible that the primitive practice of installing a substitute king when the actual monarch was threatened, has its roots in the parallel conception of realistic representation. The identification of the subject and king is actually a reversal of the feature of realistic representation of the group leader. For a discussion of this practice, see H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, Chicago, 1948, pp. 262ff., S.H. Hooke, "The Theory and Practise of Substitution," Vetus Testamentum, Vol. II, Leiden, 1952. pp. 3f.

³Cf. W.O.E. Cesterley, "Early Hebrew Festival Rituals," Myth and Ritual, op.cit., pp. 143f., A.R. Johnson comments, "The implications are obvious. We have here a clear indication that the well-being of the nation as a social unit is bound up with the life of the king and that possibly, this intimate relationship between king and his people is symbolized or rather, perhaps, realized by the continual burning of a lamp within the royal sanctuary." "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," The Labyrinth, op.cit., pp. 73.f.

such as Lamentations 4:20, "The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, was taken in their pits ..." ¹ further confirms the contention that the king was identified with the vitality of the nation.

There are other passages which describe the "Anointed," but apply the title almost without distinction to the people. The representation of the king is realistic enough for "anointed" and "people" to be synonymous. Note for example, Habakkuk 3:13, "Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, to save thy Christ (i.e. anointed)." Psalm 18:50 speaks of the great deliverance which the Lord effects for His King, shewing mercy to His Christ, to David and to his seed continually. But it is not the head distinguished from Israel, his people as

¹There are numerous parallel expressions in the Amarna Letters and elsewhere, to the life-giving breath of the divine sovereign. This has led ~~to~~ a number of writers to adopt the opinion that the Hebrews also thought of their king as divine. S.A. Cook remarks cautiously, "Certain individuals become representative ... While a group may be spoken of as a single individual, a single individual can for all intents and purposes represent a group. The 'part' then stands for the whole, either occasionally, as in the case of collective responsibility, blood-feud, scapegoats, etc., or in the more permanent function of ruler or priest ... He (the king) represents in one sense, the god to the people, and, in another sense, the people to the god. He is an intermediary and intercessor, responsible for benefits and evils, and the natural culprit or scapegoat when things go wrong. In the solidarity of king-group-god, the king is the individual, and his position and functions so vital that he is the "centre" of the national cult which grows up around him." "Notes Appended to W.R. Smith," op.cit., p. 591. The more extreme position adopted by several Scandinavian scholars (cf. e.g., Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, Uppsala, 1943), has been modified by A.R. Johnson and G.E. Wright. The former writer concludes, "... In Israelite thought, the king was a potential 'extension' of the personality of Yahweh; and here all the emphasis lies on the word in italics, for to say more is to overlook the significance of the covenant relationship between Yahweh as the God-head and the reigning member of the House of David. "Divine Kingship and the Old Testament," Ex. T., Vol. 62, 1950, p. 42. For a discussion of recent conclusions see ibid., pp. 36ff. Contending against the same Scandinavian conclusions, G.E. Wright says, "The Israelite king like most Mesopotamian kings was not deified." The Old Testament Against Its Environment, op.cit., p. 64. Cf. further, pp. 65ff.; W. Manson's explanation of Ps. 2, and the basis for the sanction of the ascriptions relating to David and to the Messiah. Jesus the Messiah, London, 1943. p. 103.

Psalms 28:8 declares, "The Lord is their strength and he is the strength of salvation of his anointed ..." (cf. Ps. 2:2, 20:7 and especially Ps. 105:15).¹

The solidarity of the king and the nation is particularly obvious in the interaction of religious conditions. The explanation behind the epithet attached to Jeroboam, "who made Israel to sin" (cf. I Kings 22:52; 15:30; 16:2), lies in the indivisible unity which must characterize the royal leader and his subjects. The same psychic unity explains the possibility of the purification of the nation under Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah. They were good kings, and the nation under their leadership followed their example in docility. The evil of the king may well have been the result of a national trend, rather than merely an expression of his own individuality. All the same, the representative character of the king inevitably implies for evil or for good, that the nation will partake of that character.

5. The Realistic Representation of the Priest. - In the carrying out of the national liturgical worship, the priest was a more important figure than the king.²

¹C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, Cambridge, 1939, p. 156. Cf. A.R. Johnson, "The Role of the King," op.cit., p. 77; A. Bentzen, Messias, Moses redivivus, Menschensohn, Zurich, 1948, p. 33. In so far as the figure of the Messiah is employed by the prophets, Guignebert claims that there is no reference to an individual, "but a kind of collective personality composed of the endless line of Davidic kings who were to be the future rulers of Israel." The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans S.H. Hooke, New York, 1939, p. 130.

²J. Pedersen designates the relationship of the priest to the king as equivalent to a servant who maintained the cult of the people in the holy strength upon which the kingship depended, III-IV, 164. S.H. Hooke sees the dualism of the function of the priest and king as a comparatively late development. There was previous to this a stage in which there was no sharp differentiation in the culture of the Near East. "... The focus of the attempt to secure the well-being of the community was a single individual possessing qualities of strength, or knowledge, or both, which indicated him as the center of the ritual life of the community." "The Myth and Ritual Pattern in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic," The Labyrinth, op.cit., p. 214. Cf. also W.C. Graham and H.G. May, Culture and Conscience, Chicago, 1935, pp. 101f.

The rationale for the importance of sacerdotal mediation was the conception of the unity of the nation. It was considered quite impossible for the individual "... to become shut up in himself and to achieve a private and isolated relation between God and the soul."¹ Proximity to God was gained through recognizing the realistic representation of the priest as he incorporated the group in himself and presented himself as a corporate personality to God. The conceptions of sacrifice and the priestly role, bear this point out. He was required to stand as a vicarious substitute for the individual or the community in its relationship to God.²

The ritual of the Day of Atonement will serve as an example of the realistic representation of the priest, as well as that of the offered sacrificial victim. The first requirement was that the priest should offer for himself and his family a bullock without blemish (Lev. 16:6,11). For the congregation he was to offer one goat as a sin-offering to cleanse the "uncleanness" of the people and to purify the sanctuary (Lev. 16:15,19).³ Following this, the officiating high

¹W. Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament, London, 1951, p. 37. Theologie d. Alten Testaments, III, op.cit., p. 51. Cf. J. Bright, op.cit., p. 42; L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 52; S. Mowinckel, Psalmstudien, Kristiania, 1923, V, pp. 36f. (Exkurs); G.B. Gray, op.cit., p. 81. But note the modifications of this point in O.S. Rankin, Israel's Wisdom Literature, Edinburgh, 1936, p. 55.

²Cf. S.H. Hooke, "The Theory and Practise of Substitution, op.cit., p. 11; J. Pedersen, III-IV, 362. Note in this regard the statute governing the high-priest's wearing of the engraved gold plate: "And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow ..." (Ex. 28:38).

³"This rite shows the intimate psychic connection between the sanctuary and the Israelites. The uncleanness of the temple and the sins of the people have the same effect; they are removed together and by the same means." J. Pedersen, III-IV, 454. But to such a distinction between the uncleanness of the Tent of Meeting and the sins of the people, we must with A. Büchler, take strong exception. It is not levitical impurity which defiles the temple, but the sins of the people which have a psychic relationship to it as they do to the land. On this point see the excellent and full discussion of Büchler, "The Defiling Force of Sin in the Bible," ch. 3, op.cit., pp. 212ff. The centrality of the Sanctuary significantly shows that the amphictyony of the wilderness were merged into a

priest was to take the goat offered by the congregation (vs. 5) and "to lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat" (vs. 21). The priest as the realistic representative of the nation, bore the sins of the community; hence he could transfer them to the scapegoat.¹ The living goat, thus identified with the sins of the people, was relegated to Azazel,² to symbolize the entire removal of the sins and the consequent guilt of the Congregation.

6. The Realistic Representation of One Tribe for the Nation. - The choice of the tribe of Levi to be a permanent vicarious substitute for the nation rests on the corporate unity of the group. The whole of Israel was the Lord's possession and domain (cf. Ex. 19:5f.). When the authority of the Lord had been challenged by the nation, the tribe of Levi took the part of the Lord; hence, it was appointed as the tribal national representative in the place of the first-born (cf. Ex. 32:28f. with Deut. 33:8ff.). The latter were chosen by the Lord to represent the nation, an obligation indicated in their peculiar sanctification (cf. Ex. 13:2). The responsibility of the the first-born representing the individual family was transferred to the tribe of Levi for practical efficiency (cf. Num. 3:11-13, 41, 45ff.; 8:14-18). Throughout, the transfer of

single corporation with its distinctive symbol of political integrity. L. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, Chicago, 1912, 17f. The basis for the later Jewish emphasis on the importance of the temple lies here in the Old Testament (cf. infra. 97ff.).

¹W.O.E. Oesterley and T.H. Robinson note that the unit is Israel (hence, the sacrifice is in actuality equivalent to individual sacrifice). The individual Israelite approached God as a subunit. Hebrew Religion, 2nd Ed., London, 1937, p. 264.

²Considerable difference of opinion centers on the meaning of "Azazel." S.R. Driver and C.R. North take the term to refer to a wilderness demon or spirit, to whom the sins of the people are handed over. H.B.D., Vol. I, New York, 1911, p. 207, "Sacrifice," T.W.B.B., op.cit., p. 212. B.D.B. and C. Lattey understand the term to denote "entire removal." C. Lattey, op.cit., p. 272. Cf. S.H. Hooke, "The Theory and Practice of Substitution, op.cit., pp. 8f.

the responsibility of the nation to the first-born, and from them to the Levites, the principle of solidarity is in play.¹

7. The Realistic Representation of a Righteous Intercessor. - A conception parallel to that which allowed the transfer of the responsibility of the nation to a part, or even a single member, is found in the representative role of the righteous intercessor. We may consider for example, the prayer of Nehemiah, "Howbeit thou art just in all that is brought upon us; for thou hast done right, but we have done wickedly" (9:33).² There is the same appreciation of a corporate unity found in Daniel's prayer of confession, "We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments ..." (9:5ff.). The solidarity of the nation was of such a character that all of its members were implicated in the sin of any major or minor part. By the same token, the righteous member could realistically confess the sin of the whole.

As in the case of the representative roles of priest and king, the intercessor is usually characterized by a degree of prominence. Thus, Moses offered availing intercession for Israel, because as the leader of the group, he could stand in its place (Ex. 32:31ff.). There is indication of the necessity of the intercessor being prominent found in Jeremiah 15:1 and Ezekiel 14:14. The sin of Israel is so heinous, declare the prophets, that if Moses and Samuel, in the former case, and Noah, Daniel, and Job, in the latter, were to intercede for

¹Cf. C. Lattey, *op.cit.*, p. 271; S.H. Hooke, "The Theory and Practice of Substitution," *op.cit.*, p. 12. Note further that the first-born were killed in vicarious substitution for Egypt (Ex. 12:29f. cf. Num. 3:13).

²We may quote from Oesterley's remarks on this prayer, "Very noticeable here is the corporate sense expressed in the confession of sin; it is characteristic also of later prayers of the Synagogue, and may be regarded, though in a restricted sense, as a catholic sentiment in Judaism." The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, Oxford, 1925, p. 53.

the nation, it would be of no avail or benefit.¹

8. The Realistic Representation of a Messenger. - On a lower level, the agency of messengers is thought of in terms of realistic representation. The sent are the extension of the personality of the sender. This is the reason the אֶלְיָאֵל of Jephthah say, "What hast thou to do with me," when challenging the Ammonites to battle (Judg. 11:12).² The messengers of Israel to Sihon, king of the Amorites say, "Let me pass through thy land ..." (Num. 21:22). The representatives of the nation address the priests and prophets in the place of Israel, "Should I weep in the fifth month, separating myself, as I have done these so many years" (Zech. 7:3)? There is a less apparent example in the dialogue of the envoy of Joseph with the eleven brothers when he came to recover the cup of his master. The brothers say, "... how then should we steal out of thy lord's house silver or gold? With whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die, and we also will be my lord's bondmen" (Gen. 44:8,9). Within the scope of a few phrases the speaker sees Joseph's servant as a separate individual, then as an extension of his master. The latter role is adopted by the messenger in his answer, "... He with whom it is found shall be my servant" (vs. 10).³

Riesenfeld suggests that the Hebrew understanding of the term shaliach, as,

¹Cf. S.A. Cook, The Old Testament: a Reinterpretation, op.cit., p. 117.

²A.R. Johnson's comment on this passage is relevant, "Through the agency of his messengers Jephthah ... is regarded as being present - 'in person'. In other words, the אֶלְיָאֵל, as extensions of their master's personality, are treated as actually being and not merely as representing their אֱלֹהֵי "lord." The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, op.cit., p. 10.

³Ibid., p. 10. A number of writers have claimed that this conception underlies the Old Testament depiction of the prophet as an extension of the Divine personality. They base their contention on the extremely frequent use of the phrase, "Thus saith the Lord ..." The agency of the angel which was to accompany Israel portrays this idea also. "But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak ..." (Ex. 23:20-25, especially vs. 22). The contradiction between the parallel accounts in Luke 7:3,4,6-10 and Matthew 8:5ff. is obviated by this principle.

"envoy, fully authorized agent," is significant in that the later Jewish literature has a saying, "A man's deputy is as himself."¹ The representation of the messenger is conceived realistically as incorporating the personality of the master. Throughout, there is the realism provided by the strong sense of solidarity which is well described as corporate personality.

9. The Realistic Representation of the שׂוֹמֵר. - The understanding of the function of the שׂוֹמֵר "avenger," "kinsman," "redeemer," is based on an ancient Hebrew idea of realistic solidarity. Properly, the consideration of the שׂוֹמֵר should be related to the discussion of kinship² but the features of representation are so prominent, that S.A. Cook points to the need for a study of the term in that light.³ The "avenger" is most often the son (e.g. Solomon, Amaziah) or the brother (Gideon, Joab); but he is always the nearest of kin.⁴ It is the embodiment of the family that is implied in the "redeemer." He represents the interests of the family in requiting the payment for an offence against the family (e.g. in blood-revenge),⁵ or in the redemption of the family inheritance (cf. Lev. 25:25ff., Ruth 2:20, 3:9, 4:1-8, 14). The precise character of the kin relationship is not necessarily important, but the function is significant in that the שׂוֹמֵר acts in the place of the family, as may be seen in the discussion of Boaz with Ruth; "There is a kinsman, nearer than I ... If he will perform unto thee the part of a שׂוֹמֵר well; let him do the kinsman's part: but if he will not ... then will I do the part of a kinsman to thee"

¹Mish. Ber. 5:5. "The Ministry in the New Testament," The Root of the Vine, op.cit., p. 99. Cf. S. Hanson, op.cit., pp. 33ff.

²J. Pedersen, I-II, op.cit., p. 390. Cf. M. Burrows, op.cit., p. 144.

³Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., pp. 440, 444.

⁴J. Pedersen, I-II, op.cit., p. 390.

⁵Cf. C. Lattey, op.cit., p. 271.

(Ruth 3:12f.). The $\gamma\lambda\iota\lambda$ is the realistic representative of the kin-group; hence, the duty devolves upon him to vindicate and defend its rights.

The same conception is involved in the injunctions regarding Levirate marriage. The law enjoins that the husband's brother is to perform the "duty" of raising up seed to preserve the name of the deceased (Deut. 25:5-10). The realistic character of the identity of a man with his dead brother is so close that the progeny resulting from the new union is considered to belong to the deceased.¹ It was the recognition of this factor which provoked Onan's sin, since he "knew that the seed should not be his" (Gen. 38:7-9). As in the case of the $\gamma\lambda\iota\lambda$, the leviratical duty devolves upon the nearest kin.²

Very similar in character to the ideas concerning Levirate marriage are those instances where the wife, in the event of her own sterility, proposes to give her maid to her husband. Thus, Rachel admonishes Jacob, "Go in unto Bilhah my handmaid ... that I may also be built by her" (Gen. 30:3, Heb.). When Dan is born, Rachel thanks God for her son (30:6; cf. vs. 8). Where there is a relationship of any kind, in which solidarity plays an active part, it is possible for the Hebrew to see an identity between the one who acts and the one who is acted for. This is true, because the group, as a psychic whole, is considered as a corporate personality. As long as the representative belongs to the group, he bears the personality type and may act in the place of any other member of the group.

10. Realistic Representation in the Implication of the Community in Sin. -

¹Cf. H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, op.cit., p. 29.

²When Ruth bears a son by Boaz, the women say to Naomi, "... he shall be a restorer of thy life unto thee" (Cf. Ruth 4:5 with Gen. 38:12-26). These passages show that Levirate marriage might be contracted with men other than brothers. Note H.H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament, London, 1952, p. 167. The emphasis on this point in the early composition, Tobit (between 350 and 170 B.C., is significant (cf. 6:13).



More remotely related to the aspect of realistic representation is the conception of a contamination of the the group through the sin of a part thereof. Thus far, we have discussed instances which involved the conception of representation by appointment or prerogative. When, however, an individual or group involves the nation in sin, it is of course, otherwise. Before Achan "troubled" Israel, he was a non-entity among the myriads of the people (Josh. 7:16-26). The momentous character of his infringement means however, that he comprehends the Congregation in his sin. It is for this reason that the judgment of God fell on the army of Israel and the Lord says explicitly, "Israel hath sinned ..." (7:11f.). The same universal implication of the nation occurred in the case of the trespass of Korah as the plea of Moses implies, "... Shall one man sin, and wilt thou be wroth with all the congregation" (Num. 16:22).¹ The indivisibility of the Community made the action of one member in a realistic sense the action of the whole.² For this reason one of two possible courses of action governed the judgment of a perpetrator of sin in Israel. He either must purify himself to remove the defilement of the whole community,³ or be "cut off."⁴ D. Daube distinguishes the former as community responsibility, from

¹Cf. D. Daube, op.cit., p. 156.

²The realism has often been overlooked. We may cite one example from W.H. Bennet: "The sanctity and righteousness of Israel were, so to speak, the integration of the virtues in the individual; and in theory the sanctity of Israel was annulled by a single individual sin, as in the case of Achan. Hence national righteousness ... is for the most part built up out of the righteous lives of individuals." The Theology of the Old Testament, London, 1896, p. 172. Cf. also W.O.E. Oesterley and T.H. Robinson, op.cit., p. 263.

³Ibid., These writers add, "Careful study of the ritual ... shows that conceptions of this kind underlie much of the ceremonial."

⁴That is, excommunication, or as B.D.B. take it, suffering the death penalty, as Lev. 23:29f. indicates, op.cit., 504.

the latter, which is personal.¹ "Cutting off" from the community meant more than a relinquishing of citizenship in the nation. He ceased to be a Jew. Psalm 52:7 (A.V., vs.5), "declares that the soul that sins must be amputated from the complex organism which is the whole community."²

In the communal responsibility described in Deuteronomy 21:1-9, there is no question regarding the prominence of the individual, since the culprit is unknown. The passage refers to the discovery of a murder in which the guilty party is not to be found. The City nearest the victim is responsible, and bears the guilt of the murderer, as long as he cannot be found. Says D. Daube, "God might treat the whole community as answerable or tainted by the crime committed by the one, unknown murderer. 'Lay not innocent blood unto thy people of Israel's charge,' is the prayer to be recited by the elders."³ In the chiding of Abimelech, it is not a particular man of Gerar who by violating Rebekah, might have brought guilt on all the city, but one of the people (Gen. 26:10).⁴

¹Op.cit., pp. 155-187. In the case that the sin was not expiated, it became communal responsibility.

²G.A.F. Knight, op.cit., p. 173. Cf. pp. 181f.

³Op.cit., p. 161. A. Büchler notes that the elders wash their hands to show their innocence (vs.6). The symbolic act is unique in the Old Testament but is adopted by Pilate to show his innocence of the guilt of delivering Jesus to the executioners (Matt. 27:24), whereupon the people accept for themselves and their posterity the guilt which Pilate absolves himself from. Op.cit., pp. 251f. As in the case of the Scapegoat, the heifer which the elders sacrifice is a "true substitute for the corporate personality of the community." S.H.Hooke, "The Theory and Practice of Substitution," op.cit., pp. 10f.

⁴This discussion is not intended to suggest that the Old Testament omits the consideration of the responsibility of the group for a group action or decision. There is group sin as Num. 15:23-29 shows, in drawing a distinction between the ignorant sin of the congregation and the ignorant sin of the individual. Note that it is the nation that has sinned a "great sin" in the creation and worship of the golden calf (Ex. 32:30ff.). An example of group representation is found in Num. 32. When Reuben and Gad sought permission to remain east of the Jordan, their reprimand was very severe. If the two tribes were to fail to enter the

11. Realistic Representation in Corporate Blessing. - On the opposite side from the implication of the community in sin through the sin of a member, is the principle of corporate blessing, secured through the righteousness or innocence of a member. This is the basis for Abraham's plea that Sodom should not be destroyed, even if there should be as few as ten righteous members in that community. The merit of a righteous minority is supposedly sufficient to obviate the divine judgment on a majority (cf. Gen. 18:23-32). It is the same point which is made in God's explanation for sparing Nineveh. It is absolutely just to forgive the wickedness of the majority because there are within the group 120,000 children as well as the cattle (Jonah 4:11). As in the case of the righteous ancestor, these two accounts imply, 1) the indivisible solidarity of the group, and 2) that a righteous or innocent minority of the group may act as the realistic representative of the community.

12. Realistic Representation in Contamination or Levitical Defilement. - The laws regarding the uncleanness of individuals assume the possibility of the implication of the group in levitical impurity. The point of contact through which the individual contracted uncleanness was the sense of touch, but it passed on to the group by virtue of its corporate relationship to the contaminated member. Therefore, the impure member must be removed from the community until he should be rendered pure.¹ Uncleanness and the possibility of contamination

land, God would leave the whole of the Community in the wilderness. Thus the sin of the two tribes would have meant the destruction of the twelve (cf. vs.15).

An interesting example of the corporate personality of a city is found in I Sam. 5:10ff. The principle involved is that some sort of an impersonal representation by the holy ark of Israel. Because of the judgment falling on the city, the Ekronites cry, "They have brought about the ark of the God of Israel to me, to slay me, and my people" (Heb. Cf. Isa. 3:9, Psa. 124:7, II Sam. 19:15).

¹J. Pedersen, I-II, op.cit., p. 493, comments, "... For the life of the latter (the community) must not be threatened by one person. So in the case of

is parallel to sin and the corporate implication in guilt (cf. Lev. 5:2ff.).

In the Old Testament, sin, uncleanness, and death, are interwoven through interaction.¹ In all of these factors there is possibility of contamination which may act as a blight on the corporate group, and destroy the harmony of the community with God.² Furthermore, it dissolves those distinctive barriers and characteristics which make Israel "holy" קֹדֶשׁ ; קִדְּשׁ (cf. Jer. 2:3, Ps. 114:2, Isa. 6:13, Ex. 22:30; Deut. 33:3, Ps. 16:3).³ Although the manner of the removal of sin and uncleanness are of similar kinds, we cannot go as far as Moore, to claim that from the viewpoint of the Old Testament, sin is primarily religious rather than moral, making the motive to a large extent immaterial.⁴ Sin is primarily portrayed as rebellion against God, hence it embraces the breaking of a moral injunction or a non-moral commandment.⁵

leprosy (Lev. 13)."

The basis for the injunctions against the consumption of unclean animals is a more difficult question. Pedersen explains the conception thus: "Clean is what belongs to the psychic totality, unclean that which counteracts it. He who eats an animal absorbs part of a strange soul as truly as soul and body belong closely together." I-II, 482. W.R. Smith points to a primitive conception of a union between families of men and animal kinds. Barriers between certain relationships are not to be violated. The Religion of the Semites, op.cit., p. 288ff. Cf. further E.C. Rust, op.cit., p. 54. Other writers suggest that the injunctions involve the question of health. Cf. W.H. Gispen, "Clean and Unclean," Oudtestamentische Studien, Deel V., Leiden, 1948, pp. 190-196. This writer comes closer to the Biblical representation when he sees that the injunctions against uncleanness and the eating of unclean animals were designed to maintain the holiness of Israel, Ibid., p. 196. Cf. G.F. Moore, History of Religion, Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1920, pp. 42f.

¹W.H. Gispen, op.cit., p. 196.

²G.B. Gray, op.cit., p. 81.

³See B.D.B. for numerous references, op.cit., pp. 871ff.

⁴G.F. Moore, Judaism, Cambridge, Mass., Vol. I, 1927, p. 463, The History of Religions, op.cit., p. 42.

⁵See G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., pp. 37ff, especially, p. 44. Cf. A. Büchler, op.cit., p. 269.

13. The Realistic Representation of the Sacrificial Victim. - The Hebrew conception of sacrifice involves the element of realistic substitution. Basic to the Old Testament conception of the sacrifice, is the universal doctrine of the indivisibility of sin and its consequent death penalty. This is seen in such dissimilar instances as the transgression of Adam (Gen. 3:3), the harboring of an "evil imagination" (Gen. 6:5-7), or the murmuring of the Israelites in the wilderness (Num. 21:7), to name but three of many possibilities. For this reason provision was made in the divine economy for the transfer of the penalty to a sacrificial victim. In the transaction, the principle of corporate personality which identified the sinner and his offering was involved. H.W. Robinson emphasizes this point: "The idea ... is seen in the identification of the offerer with the sacrifice, which is quite different from the idea of any transference of penalty."¹ *are blamished and unacceptable (Lev. 22:25).*

There is no necessity or compulsion to explain this identification merely on the basis of the psychic life of nature in which man shares.² As in the case of the commemoration of the passover, or circumcision, in which the initiate or member was identified with the redemptive event, it is the event of the death of the victim in which the guilty party shares, that is important. This is the impression gained from an examination of the Passover ritual outlined in

¹"Hebrew Psychology," op.cit., p. 381. Cf. R.B. Townsend, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ed., R.H. Charles, Oxford, 1913, Vol. II, p. 663.

²E.C. Rust gives an adequate summary of the ideas involved. "So intimately is the psychic life of nature bound up with that of man, that when Adam sins the ground too is cursed, and when people disobey the divine statutes the land will spue forth (Lev. 20:22). The land has indeed become an intimate part of man's spiritual life ... This diffused consciousness (pervading land and plants, cf. Hos. 2:21f.) which, as we have suggested, is not to be thought of animistically as a 'soul', but as mana diffused in natural objects, has capacity to be indwelt and used by higher powers and in particular by Yahweh Himself." op.cit., pp. 52f. Cf. also H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 15; H. Frankfort, "Myth and Reality," The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man, op.cit., pp. 5ff.; Lévy-Bruhl, op.cit., pp. 135f.

Exodus 12. The lamb was the vicarious substitute for the first-born of the nation,¹ which in turn realistically represented the nation. It is the vicarious substitution of the experience of death which must be recognized. What should have happened to the first-born, is through the principle of a sacrificial commutation of the penalty, brought upon the substitutionary victim.

There is beyond the conception of a shared experience, the necessity of possession. The animal must belong to the offerer, or be part of the household to represent adequately the psychic whole.² It is for this reason that David felt that he must purchase the sacrifice and the threshing-floor from Araunah (II Sam. 24:24), lest there should be an inadequate relationship of vicarious solidarity between the sacrificial victim and the forgiven sinner. This principle governs the injunction against Israelites offering sacrifices secured from strangers; they are blemished and unacceptable (Lev. 22:25).

The role of the realistic representation of the offering for the guilty sinner is nowhere more clearly illustrated than in the ritual of the Day of Atonement. C.R. North comments:

"Here we have a clear example of the conception of guilt transferred from the human beings who have contracted it to an animal which is guiltless, and it is significant that the guilt so transferred was guilt incurred by the commission of real sins, not merely the sins of inadvertence which were all for which any sin-offering, even those on the Day of Atonement, could make expiation."³

When we examine the role of the Servant, portrayed in the Songs of the Servant (Isa. 42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, 52:13-53:12), we may note an integration of the ideas latent in the ritual of the scape-goat and the Israelite guilt

¹T.H. Gaster emphasizes the element of kinship ties which the ceremony established and which were outwardly manifested by the sign of blood, since the essence of kinship is blood, op.cit., p. 20.

²A.R. Johnson, The One and the Many ..., op.cit., p. 8.

³T.W.B.B., op.cit., p. 213.

offering.¹ Fundamental to both ritual elements was the conception of the solidarity of the group. This feature is noted in S.A. Cook's comments on the Songs:

The idea of vicarious atonement ... was latent in the ideas of group solidarity ... If Israel had received double for her sins (Isa. 40:2), might not the surplus have a saving efficacy for others? If the Servant was afflicted beyond all due, might not his extreme sufferings have a wider atoning value? Indeed, the Deutero-Isaiah is characterized by the teaching of a world-unity and a One-God; and it can fairly be urged that the idea of atonement for the group is only being extended to the utmost limits.²

The atonement of the Servant is not possible without the prior identification with the group, whether Israel, or the world. It is because the אִישׁ הַיָּמִינִי is the realistic representative of Israel, that he may suffer vicariously and bear the sins of Israel (cf. 53:4-6,10). In his representation, "The Servant so completely unites himself with the people that it is true to say that he is the people and the people is the Servant. We must recognize both, that he is throughout not the people, and yet nevertheless is the people."³

The difficulty of the conception of the embodiment of the group by the individual in the Servant Songs has given rise to a number of explanatory theories.⁴

¹There is an indication that the scape-goat ritual provides the frame of reference in which the self-offering of the Servant is cast. Of the scape-goat we read, "And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities to the land of cutting off" ($\text{וְהָיָה עָלָיו כָּל עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ}$, Lev. 16:22). Of the Suffering Servant, Isaiah 53:8 says, "For he was cut off (וְהָיָה כָּרְעוּל) from the land of the living," implying that the Servant fulfils in an expanded form the role of the goat which bore the sins of the nation on the Day of Atonement. Cf. E.G. King, The Yalkut on Zechariah, Cambridge, 1882, p. 105. On the other hand that the death of the Servant is thought of in terms of sacrifice is evident from the use of the technical term זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת "guilt offering," (53:10). Cf. H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," op.cit., p. 104.

²Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., pp. 491f.

³W. Vischer, Jahrbuch der theologischen Schule Bethel, ed. Th. Schlatter, Bethel bei Bielefeld, 1930, p. 102. "It is the 'paradox' of the unio mystica capitis et corporis." Ibid., p. 103. Noted from C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, London, 1948, p. 112. To the idea of the unio mystica, we must with L. Kohler, op.cit., p. 172, take exception.

⁴C.R. North, op.cit., passim.

In O. Eissfeldt's reasons for taking exception to the explanation of "personification," we may note a clear insight into the Hebrew conception of solidarity:

The Hebrews were Semites, and they did not, as we do, think of a community as the sum-total of the individuals comprising it, thus creating an 'absolute unity' out of a 'mass of individuals.' To them unity is prior to diversity, the community prior to the individual; the real entity is the community, and the individuals belonging to it have their origin therein.¹

This issues in what we have sought to describe as the element of corporate personality. Only some form of this conception does justice to the mystery of the Servant being at once the group and at the same time a member of it,² if the explanation of personification is once relinquished. Thus, the Servant of the Lord is the culmination of the Hebrew conception of realistic representation in sacrifice. He stands as a substitute for Israel and for the whole world,³ yet not apart from the conception of this substitute as the embodiment of the nation and corpus humanum in whose place he bows to receive the judgment of God.

¹The Ebed-Yahweh in Isaiah 40-55 in the Light of the Israelite Conceptions of the Community and the Individual, the Ideal and the Real, Ger. ed., Halle, 1933, E.T., p.264. Noted in C.R. North, op.cit., p. 106.

²This is the conclusion drawn and maintained in H.W. Robinson, The Cross of the Servant, London, 1926, (see e.g., p. 44), and Werden und Wesen, op.cit., pp. 58ff. C.R. North accepts this explanation, op.cit., p. 205. Of this passage T.W. Manson says, "There is a constant oscillation between the conception of the social group, family, clan, tribe, nation — as an association of individuals in the plural or as a single living social organism about which one can more properly speak in the singular. Where the tendency to think of the social group as a single organism ('one flesh') is powerful, there is often also a strong tendency to see the corporate personality as embodied or expressed in an individual." The Servant Messiah, Cambridge, 1953, p. 74. A.G. Hebert expresses much the same sentiment, "In the Songs of the Servant, Isaiah is saying in more concrete form what Jeremiah and Ezekiel had said in more abstract language in their prophecies of the New Covenant and the New Spirit. Not what He will do for but in His people ..." The Throne of David, London, 1941, p. 68. Cf. G.A. Danell, "The Idea of the People of God in the Bible," The Root of the Vine, op.cit., p. 34.

³Cf. S.H. Hooke, "The Theory and Practice of Substitution," op.cit., pp. 15f.

The Aspect of Oscillation

1. Introduction. - The term "oscillation" has been chosen to convey a characteristic of the Hebrew thought process which enabled him to conceive of the individual as the embodiment of the group, and the group as an individual.¹ It is found in the fluidity of transition from the individual to the society and vice versa.² It must be accepted as a genuine characteristic of the Hebrew mind, manifesting itself in speech and writing, and requiring the conception of the corporate personality of the group for an adequate explanation.
2. Oscillation in Common Speech. - Oscillation is not a rare feature in the transaction of business between two groups. A good example is found in the dialogue between the embassy of Israel and Sihon. "Let me pass through thy land: we will not turn into the fields ..." (Num. 21:22). Edom threatened the tribes of Israel that wished to pass through the southern part of Canaan thus, "Thou shalt not pass by me, lest I come out against thee with the sword;" but, makes the portent of evil patent by coming out "with mush people" (Num. 20:18,20). In this same passage Israel is spoken of in the plural (vvs. 14-17) but is addressed by Edom in the singular (see supra p.49). Of the judgment of Achan, the text reads, "And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones" (Josh. 7:25). Such examples of the transition from the individual to the collective and vice versa are relatively frequent (note e.g. Ex. 34:15, Heb.; Deut. 4 *passim*, 7:25,

¹ Lévy-Bruhl speaks of a primitive view of reality in which things, beings and phenomena can in a manner incomprehensible to us be at once themselves and something other than themselves. Op.cit., p. 76. H.W. Robinson says, "It permits the primitive mind to think at the same time of the individual in the collective and the collective in the individual." Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 53. We must ascribe the term "primitive" to Israel and its psychology with caution. Hebrews were not primitive in the technical sense usually ascribed to that word. H.H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays, op.cit., p. 38.

²H.W. Robinson, Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 53.

8:19, 14:21, etc.).¹

3. Oscillation in the Psalms. - The recognition of the feature of oscillation is of importance to the proper understanding of the Psalms. In Psalm 22, for example, the writer is distinguished from the community in vs. 25, "My praise shall be of thee in the great congregation ..." In vs. 6, he is the group-representative, "a reproach of men." Verse 27 suggests that the nation is in mind for "... all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee."² In a less questionable example, Psalm 44 has a transition between plural and singular no less than six times. In the parallel Psalms 14 and 53, the singular $\text{? } \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}}$ "fool," becomes the plural subject of the next phrase, "They are corrupt, they have done abominable works ..." (Ps. 14:1).³

H.W. Robinson sees in the transition from the individual to the group an

¹The Rabbis, evidently misunderstanding the principle under discussion, were not loath to derive homiletical value from the distinction between the plural and singular when they referred to Israel. "Of the Torah it says, 'Its ways are peaceful ways' (Proverbs 3:17). God purposed to give the Torah to Israel immediately when they left Egypt, but they were quarrelsome. Hour after hour, one said to the other, 'Let us appoint a chief and return to Egypt' (Num. 14:4). It says, 'They journeyed from Sukkoth, they encamped in Etham;' they were journeying in contention and they were camping in contention. But when they reached Rephidim, they all became reconciled and united into one single band, for when Israel arrived there, 'He encamped face to face with Sinai' (Ex. 19:2), not 'they' encamped, but 'he.'" Tanh B. Yitro 37b. R.A., op.cit., p. 536. See also the contrast drawn between the plural "souls" of Esau's progeny and the single soul of Jacob's descendants (cf. Gen. 36:4 with Ex. 1:5) in Lev. R. 4.6.

²This analysis is suggested by H.W. Robinson, The Cross of the Servant, op.cit., p. 35.

³Cf. C.A. Briggs, The Book of Psalms, I.C.C., Vol., I, Edinburgh, 1907, pp. 103ff.

Recent studies have contended that the Psalms have reflections of the conception of the Primal Man. A Bentzen suggests that this idea is found in Ps. 8 where the "Son of Man" is almost a god and controls all the subjected creation (cf. Ps. 2). So also Ps. 45:7 emphasizes the lordship of the King over all the earth but harks back to Gen. 1:26 for its commentary. (See A. Bentzen, op.cit., pp. 12ff. for evidence and O.T. parallels.) This theory although very questionable does afford interesting parallels to the Old Testament conception of the solidarity of Adam with mankind; and the king with his realm.

explanation for the complete absence of intercessory prayers in the Psalter. Even the most personal Psalm is potentially vicarious.¹ As in the case of the righteous intercessor, the Psalmist is one with his group, so that his prayer is the plea of the community.² Mowinckel has used the term "community mysticism," to describe the Hebrew cult, remarking that "the conception of the community as a 'great ego' is genuinely Semitic — and genuinely primitive; and makes itself felt particularly in the cult where the communio sanctorum emerges as a body and soul."³

4. Oscillation and Daniel's Figure of the Son of Man. — The natural way in which the transition is made from the figure who is "like unto a Son of Man" to the Saints of the Most High, illustrates the principle of oscillation still further.⁴ It is not a member acting for the group (as the use of the first person singular in the Psalms indicated), but an objective description. The

¹Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 83. According to L. Köhler and W.A. Irwin, Ps. 51, is an example. L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 168; W.A. Irwin, "The Hebrews," op.cit., p. 260.

²Cf. W.R. Smith, op.cit., p. 264; S. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien, Kristiana, I, 165, n.1; Psalms of Solomon 13:1f., 16:1ff.; G.C. Macaulay's translation of Herodotus I. c. 132, "For himself alone separately the man who sacrifices may not request good things in his prayer, but he prays that it may be well with all the Persians and with the king for he himself also is included of course in the whole body of Persians."

³S. Mowinckel, op.cit., I, 164, 165. Cf. also V, 1923, pp. 36f. n.1. and W.H. Robinson, Werden u. Wesen, p. 57.

⁴The figure of the Son of Man is non-Jewish in origin according to C.H. Kraeling, Anthropos and Son of Man, New York, 1927, p. 134. Cf. J.M. Creed, "The Heavenly Man", J.T.S., Vol. 26, 1925, p. 132, and J.Y. Campbell, "The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man," J.T.S., Vol. 48, 1947, p. 149. The aspect of oscillation between the individual and collective group is however, Hebraic, as the evidence shows. Certainly there is no need to posit with Mowinckel (Han Som Kommer) that the Son of Man in Daniel is no more than a symbol of the Holy People, i.e. Israel. Cf. G. Lindeskog, "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," The Root of the Vine, op.cit., p. 115. Since oscillation is not evident in Ps. 8, C.H. Dodd may well be correct in suggesting that the Son of Man is more of a generic figure that includes the whole race. The Old Testament in the New, London, 1952. pp. 11f.

prophet saw a figure resembling a man, which in reality was the Saints of the Most High.¹ Thus, the Son of Man was a collective personality. He could be described equally well by the singular or plural. This figure is important in the New Testament, consequently it will receive further treatment there (cf. infra).

5. The Oscillation in the Songs of the Servant. - Equally objective to the writer is the equipoise between the Servant as Israel, and as an individual in Isaiah's description of the נִבִּיָּא דְיִשְׂרָאֵל. Israel, "the seed of Abraham," is the Servant in Isaiah 41:8f. It is difficult to determine whether the individualistic terms of Isaiah 42:1-4 apply to Israel or to the individual Servant.² In Isaiah 44:1,21, The Servant is again identified with Israel, the nation (cf. also 45:4 and 48:20). Isaiah 49:1-6 so telescopes the nation and the individual (or remnant) that it becomes enigmatic. A further complication is introduced by the use of the first person:

... And said unto me, Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified. Then I said, I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength ... And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel be not

¹J.Y. Campbell, op.cit., p. 141.

²H.W. Robinson claims that this passage relates to the mission of Israel, i.e. to bring יְשׁוּעָה to the nations. Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 58. Cf. S. Blank who designates the Servant as the personification (?) of a people acting as a prophet. "A prophet — one man — is sent to a people; to mankind a whole people bears witness." "The Dissident Laity in Early Judaism," H.U.C.A., Vol. 19, 1945-46, p. 28. Cf. also his "Studies in Deutero-Isaiah," H.U.C.A., Vol. 15, 1940, pp. 18ff. Bentzen following Mowinckel, prefers relating the idea at least, to kingship, asserting the parallel between the cultus of the dying king in the New Year Festival in many of the Psalms and contemporary literature, with the dying Servant. Op.cit., pp. 21,25. Later on, Bentzen points out that he thinks the prophetic element is paramount and harks back to Moses for its prototype. Ibid., pp. 64ff. and the Introduction to the Old Testament, 2nd Ed., Vol. II, Copenhagen, 1952, p. 112. Contrast G.E. Wright, The Old Testament Against its Environment, op.cit., pp. 65f., in criticism of Scandinavian theories on the dying king and New Year Festival.

gathered yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength.¹

Although the addressee is Israel (cf. v. 3) it cannot be all of the actual nation, for the mission of the Servant is to convert Israel, and with that accomplishment to be a light to the Gentiles (cf. v. 6). It must either be an individual or a personified remnant,² which the writer embodies.³ Isaiah 50:4-9 is most clearly individual in its characterization of the Servant (note especially vs. 6 where back, cheeks, hair, and face are mentioned).⁴ The transition from the plural 'you' (52:12) to the singular third person (52:13 - 53:12) again apparently requires an individual interpretation.⁵

The expansion and contraction of the terms which are used to describe the Servant of the Lord in this section of Isaiah have posed problems for the interpretation of this figure which are still very much in dispute. Two recent

¹Isa. 49:3-5, Cf. Ps. 136:22, Jer. 30:10, 46:27,28, for a similar designation of the nation as the Servant of God.

²See C.R. North's examination of this question, op.cit., passim. G.A. Danell notes the Old Testament emphasis on a remnant which exists in a position of solidarity with God down through history. Isaiah pictures this remnant personified (or embodied) in the Messiah, the root of Jesse (cf. Jeremiah's "semah", 23:5), and in the role of the Lord's Servant "The Idea of God's People in the Bible," op.cit., p. 33. For a brief discussion of the Old Testament concept of the Remnant, see, E.W. Heaton, "The Root $\sqrt{\text{Jesse}}$ and the Doctrine of the Remnant," J.T.S., New Series, Vol. III, 1, April, 1952, passim.

³Embodiment in the sense already illuminated in the discussion of the realistic representation of the leader or prominent figure in the group. Contrast S.A. Cook's dissatisfaction with an explanation of personification or embodiment. He suggests in its place some idealization or fusion of types — "the Servant is an abstract conception, a permanent type ..." like the conception of humanity. Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., p. 492.

⁴H.W. Robinson admits this, but understands the mission for God in a collective sense. Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 59. Cf. A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, op.cit., pp. 110f.

⁵H.W. Robinson takes this reference to refer to Israel as a whole (Werden u. Wesen, op.cit., p. 59), thus concurring with the almost universal Jewish opinion on the meaning of the passage. For an exhaustive examination of the Jewish interpretations see, A. Neubauer and S.R. Driver, The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters, Vols. I,II, Oxford, 1876.

writers have investigated the problem and published the results for the English-speaking world. C.R. North and H.H. Rowley substantially agree. We may quote a summary of Rowley's conclusions:

It is probable that the Servant is in part the personification of the mission of Israel, and in part the delineation of one who should embody its mission with peculiar fulness so that he should play a notable part in the achievement of the Golden Age ... Something of the fluidity of what has become known as 'corporate personality' is found here, so that the Servant is both the community and an individual who represents it. While the mission will be peculiarly fulfilled in one, it is nevertheless the mission to which all are called, and all should enter in some measure into it.¹

In the oscillation between the collective and individual, there is evidence to confirm the conclusion that the Songs employ the Hebrew conception of corporate personality to present the idea of the Servant as the Realistic Representative of Israel.

Conclusion

The foregoing presentation of the Hebrew conception of the corporate personality of the nation and its composite units is not exhaustive. The limitations of the space allowed would make that an impossible task. On the other hand, from the evidence presented, one clear fact emerges — the ancient Hebrew conception of solidarity held unity in higher esteem than its more modern sociological counterparts. This unity did not result from external imposition, but was fundamentally grounded in the psychological conditioning of the Israelite in the Old

¹"The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," op.cit., pp. 108f. Cf. also H.H. Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, London, 1944, pp. 53f. For more extensive studies by Rowley, see, Israel's Mission to the World, London, 1939, and The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament, op.cit., pp. 1-57. The difference between C.R. North and Rowley is not great. In brief North sees a linear progression from Israel as the Servant to an individual who will fulfil that role, op.cit., p. 216. Rowley, on the other hand, accepts the factor of oscillation in that the fourth song, while predominately individual involves Israel is the fulfillment of his mission. For a concise presentation of recent Scandinavian opinions see, C.R. North, "The Suffering Servant: Current Scandinavian Discussions," Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. III, 1950. pp. 363ff.

Testament period.

The evidence which can be garnered from almost every page of the Old Testament, approves H.W. Robinson's choice of the descriptive term, "corporate personality". It is equivalent to W.R. Smith's employment of the metaphor of a tree to describe the ancient Semitic conception of the solidarity of the group. The race has a life of its own, of which individual lives are only parts. On the basis of the analogy between the group and a tree, the ancestor is the root, and the descendants are the branches.¹ The whole produces an organic unity transcending time and space and is properly described as a collective personality. We shall find justification for employing this conception to explain the Pauline conceptions of solidarity.

The Unity of the Human Race in the

Old Testament

1. The Unity of Mankind Through Origin and Development. - The diminished consciousness of solidarity in the expansion of the group from the immediate family to the nation may be extended to embrace the whole of mankind.² While the term "corporate personality", is only applicable in a restricted sense, the doctrine of the solidarity of the race finds considerable support in the Old Testament.

Many of the ideas which we have presented to illustrate the Hebrew self-consciousness of national unity are in reality unmodified in their application to humanity. As in the case of Israel, a man in the Old Testament is seen as a part of a community of men extending through all time and including all nations.³ It

¹Op.cit., p. 41.

²Quoting from R.M. McIver, Community, London, 1917, p. 23, "It will be seen that a community may be a part of a wider community, and that all community is a question of degree;" from the extreme extent of the world down to the intense community in which one lives.

³Cf. e.g. Ex. 12:42 (Heb.), "This is a night of observation of all the children of Israel in their generations."

was Noah out of his generation, the particular segment of humanity which was contemporaneous with him, which received favor from God (Gen. 7:1; cf. Judges 2:10 and Gen. 17:9). The successive generations originating with the creation of man are the generations of Adam (Gen. 5:1 and following); not generations following Adam, indicating, as it were, that the life of the first man continues in the community of his descendants although he himself dies. He fulfils the same role for the race that the national ancestor held in the case of tribal or larger units.

Beyond the partaking of a common life traceable to a single origin, the Old Testament points with significance to the creation of men by the one unique God.¹ The creation of Adam was effected through the transformation of dust by the life-giving breath of God (Gen. 2:7). But the creation was as unique as was the God Who performed it, consequently all men participated in that one creative act of God. There was none other. All men share in the common flesh of which Adam was composed (note supra p.40). As Adam was created in the likeness and image of God (Gen. 1:27), generic man continues to partake of that same characterization (Ps. 8:4,6). In other words, as God is one, and unchangeable, so also is humanity one, forming a continuity over against the immutability of God (cf. Num. 16:22).²

The unity of mankind is not only physical (i.e. generic), but also moral, implying a mutual responsibility to one another under God. The whole of the race forms a family that guarantees rights to all of its members by virtue of their being human. For this reason murder is condemned (Ex. 20:13, Gen. 9:6) and love is enjoined in the Israelite's treatment of the alien. He has no other rights

¹Cf. S. Hanson, op.cit., p. 7. Note Josh. 3:11,13; Ps. 97:5, Micah 4:13, Zech. 4:14, 6:5.

²Cf. L. Kbhler, op.cit., p. 62.

than his common membership in the human family (Lev. 25:35ff.).

All men, because they compose the extension of the family of Adam¹ partake of the character of the universal ancestor, even as generically they bear his name, $\square \uparrow \lambda$.² Like their ancestral father, they share in the weakness of the flesh.³ The implication that the curse which Adam and Eve incurred through their disobedience, was inherited by their progeny, is very strong as the elements of the curse continue to plague the race.⁴

The problem of Original Sin has evoked a great amount of study in the Old Testament. Most recent writers profess not to find the conception.⁵ Be that as it may, the relationship drawn between the original disobedience of Adam and

¹An objection might be raised to this statement on the grounds of the account of the "sons of God" (lit. בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים) mentioned in Gen. 6:2,4. Besides the inconclusive character of the interpretation of this passage, it must be noted that the "giants" did not become a separate race. K. Köhler says cogently, "... The spirit of the Biblical language indicates rightly that the individual is only a son of man, — ben adam — that is, a segment or member of the human race, but not the perfect exemplification of the whole of mankind." Jewish Theology, New York, 1918, p. 310.

²Cf. W.D. Davies, op.cit., p. 57, n.4. Cf. L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 113.

³A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 190. Cf. H. Schultz, Old Testament Theology, trans. J.A. Paterson, 2nd ed., Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1898, p. 244; L. Köhler, op.cit., pp. 121f. Note such passages as Isa. 31:3, II Chron. 32:8, Jer. 17:5, Psalm 103:15.

⁴Note that Eve's name was chosen to indicate her status as the mother of the race. "More particularly she is responsible for the future position of woman in the world (Gen. 3:16), as Adam is for that of man (Gen. 3:17-19), no less than for that of the "Adamah itself" (Gen. 3:17-19). C. Lattey, op.cit., p. 270.

⁵Cf. e.g., H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, op.cit., p. 57; F.R. Tennant, The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin, Cambridge, 1903, pp. 97f. S.A. Cook says that it is due to "ideological rather than to historical continuity when later generations link together the Fall of Man and persistence of sin." The Old Testament: A Reinterpretation, op.cit., p. 119: See further "sin" in J.R. Coates trans. of the T.W.N.T., Bible Key Words, New York, 1951, p. 30.

subsequent sin and death, is definitive (cf. Gen. 2:17).¹ The dictum, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," (Ezek. 18:4,20), is no less characteristic of the Old Testament than of the New. The universality of human sin is a familiar teaching in the Old Testament; it is well illustrated in the prayer of Solomon, "... For there is no man that sinneth not" (I Kings 8:46; cf. Gen. 6:5, Ps. 53:3, Prov. 20:9, Eccl. 7:20, Isa. 53:6, 64:6).² This universality of sin arises out of the corporate unity of the race and the indivisibility of sin itself. A statement of A.B. Davidson will emphasize this point:

All sin is one sin of the race. The unity of the race is a consistent doctrine of the Old Testament. It was אָדָם man, when created as a single individual. It spread over the earth and was still אָדָם, man. It was כָּל בָּשָׂר, all flesh, that had corrupted its way before the flood. Mankind is, as a whole corrupt; and, corresponding to this, each individual is unclean. Smaller sections of it, as families, nations, are also sinful, and he that is born in the one or belongs to the other shares in the sinfulness.³

The latter point is supported by such passages as Psalm 79:8, 65:7, Jeremiah 14:20, which combine the sins of fathers and sons in such a manner as to imply a community of guilt incorporates the group. In the same way, the punishment is inclusive enough to cover the broader realm of guilt.⁴ The nature of sin lends itself to this universal distribution, for it is, in Old Testament eyes, much more than the act. It refers to the relationship of man to a personal God; but, man indivisibly united with other men as well. Because sin involves the whole man and is contagious and contaminating, the Old Testament offers no other rationale for

¹Cf. W. Eichrodt, Vol. III, op.cit., pp. 97ff.; G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., p. 37. H.W. Robinson may be correct in maintaining that man is naturally mortal according to the Genesis account, but in any case the exclusion of the sons of Adam from access to the tree of life and their consequent mortality, is due to Adam's sin. The Christian Doctrine of Man, op.cit., p. 60.

²See W.A. Irwin, The Old Testament: Keystone of Human Culture, op.cit., pp. 72ff.

³The Theology of the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 218.

⁴Cf. L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 162.

the universal spread of sin than to maintain the individual's connection with the whole.¹

Job pointedly remarks regarding mankind, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one" (14:4). The Psalmist cries that he has been "shapen in iniquity" and "conceived in sin" (51:5; cf. the universality of sin in Job. 4:17, 25:4, Prov. 20:9, II Chron. 6:36, Ps. 130:3, 143:2, see supra p.69). In substance, these references do not indicate a different manner of involvement in sin from the contamination or corporate participation in the sin of a group member.

In brief, so much can be established from the Old Testament:²

1) The human race is a unity in God's estimation as is Adam, whose acts were the acts of humanity.³

2) Sin is as much a unity as is humanity, and that as the one developed into millions, the one sin multiplied into millions of sinful acts; but the $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\pi\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ of Adam was what abounded all the while.

3) The sin of Adam being the sin of the race, God visited His displeasure on the race. It need not extend over all but over many more than are personally guilty. The innocent are not held guilty but the unit which is humanity is held guilty.

This point will receive more extensive treatment in chapter three. It is sufficient to note that the groundwork of Paul's teaching on the unity of the race and involvement in Adam's sin, is found in the Old Testament.

2. The Solidarity of Man and the Creation. - The sin of man is regarded as the

¹A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, op.cit., pp. 218f. and F.R. Tennant, op.cit., p. 104. Cf. W. Eichrodt, op.cit., III, 95; G.E. Wright's fine discussion in The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, pp. 39ff. A.G. Hebert, The Bible from Within, London, 1950, p. 29.

²These conclusions have been drawn in substance by A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 224.

³Cf. G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., p. 49.

origin of the cursing of the entire creation,¹ suggesting that a solidarity exists between the race and the whole realm of existence. This point is clear from the Genesis account of the punishment of Adam (3:17-19). Various changes from the norm of the original creation of nature are directly attributed to man's sin. These are to remain concomitantly to the continued sin of the race. Here, a solidarity of the human family with creation is a parallel expansion of the Old Testament teaching on the integral relationship of Israel and ארץ ישראל. In disobeying the divine statutes, the nation incurs divine judgment. The land will spue them forth (Lev. 20:22). It was because the nations previously occupying Palestine defiled the land that they were cast out (Lev. 18:24f.). Thus, the land for Israel and the creation for mankind, forms a definite part of man's spiritual life.²

The present universal conditions will continue until a successful challenge will be launched by Him Who is the Branch from the stump of Jesse. With the restoration of righteousness, a new pattern of natural behaviour will be inaugurated (Isa. 11). Herein lies the necessity for the universal efficacy of the mission of the Servant of the Lord, greatly transcending the scope of the liturgy of the Day of Atonement, until it embraces the whole world.³ With his universal vicarious guilt-offering which presupposes the unity of man under sin, lies the hope for a universal redemption of mankind through his vicarious solidarity with the race.⁴ The redemption of mankind implies the restoration of the creation to its original glory.

¹10. Cullmann, Christ and Time, trans. F.V. Filson, London, 1951, p. 101.
 Cf. G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., p. 35;
⁴Ez. 8:11, 2 Bar. 23:4.

²Cf. E.C. Rust, op.cit., p. 52.

³Cf. H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," op.cit., p. 104; S.A. Cook, Cambridge Ancient History, op.cit., pp. 489, 491f.

⁴Cf. C. Lattey, op.cit., pp. 272f.

3. Conclusion. - The primary difference between the conception of the solidarity of the nation and that of the race of men, lies in the "feeling of community"¹ registered in the former, but seldom felt in the latter. In the confined group, common aims and interest tended to unite its members dependent upon its unity for their common welfare. Besides this, there were rites to enhance or renew group unity,² or to arouse collective enthusiasm.³ The unity of mankind, on the other-hand, belonged to the realm of theoretical knowledge, but was easily destroyed by the exclusiveness of its segments through selfish rivalry. It is to the credit of the Old Testament, that it never lost sight of the solidarity of the race of men by looking forward to a universal restoration. There is further no mistaking the background of the later Jewish conception of the Aeon which became so influential in the New Testament interpretation of the significance of the Messiah's advent.

Conclusion

The foregoing pages have presented some of the evidence illuminating the Hebraic conceptions of solidarity. Certain conclusions must be conceded in that regard. The foremost of these is a point made by William Robinson, "The Old Testament has no meaning apart from the solidarity of the nation, the 'people of God'".⁴ This solidarity is of such a nature, that it has been considered appropriate to use the term "corporate personality," to describe the unity of Israel and the constituent elements (i.e. family, tribe, etc.). Both the fact and the implications of the conception of the extension of the personality of an

¹S.A. Cook notes that the limits of any group were determined by this factor, i.e. the feeling of community or "group consciousness." The Cambridge Ancient History, p. 438.

²Cf. e.g. "commensality", in W.R. Smith, op.cit., pp. 269, 274.

³S.A. Cook, Notes appended to W.R. Smith, The Religion of the Semites, op.cit., p. 505.

⁴The Biblical Doctrine of the Church, op.cit., p. 29.

individual (ancestor or leader) have been examined in the light of Old Testament thought and contemporary ideas.

Two major factors interact in producing the conception of solidarity which the Old Testament evinces. 1) An original and fundamental factor was the unity based on generic descent. 2) Hardly less fundamental was the factor of acquisition. Through fulfilling the necessary functions one was admitted within the confines of the community. The frame-work of this conception of acquisition was Israel's covenant. These two features are the two pillars upon which the unity of the nation stood. They became increasingly important in the post-Biblical reference to the unity of Israel.

1. The Factor of Heredity. - The importance of heredity in the securing of the solidarity of the group cannot be overlooked with impunity. The unity of the family, the most solid integer of Hebrew society, was founded on this principle. Thus, through extending the principle, the average unschooled Israelite considered the unbroken line of descent back to Abraham as an unqualified pass for inclusion into the community of the People of God. When, God chose Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, He chose also their seed.¹ A favorite metaphor is encountered in the figure of a tree to illustrate this generic unity. Thus, we read of Israel casting forth its roots as Lebanon (Hosea 14:6, Heb.) or of a future day when Jacob shall take root (Isa. 27:6). Hosea speaks of Israel's branches spreading, and of beauty comparable to the olive tree (14:7, Heb.). Israel is

¹So says Pedersen, "Community goes deeper than one generation; it extends backwards as well as forwards through history. We see this whenever we consider the family. From father to son the same soul grows through time; it is the same in preceding and succeeding generations, just as at any time it is common to the whole family ... The relation to the fathers cannot be decided merely by the sons deriving the substance of their souls from them. It is true that the fathers form a long succession through the generations but the differences in time are not decisive ... The fathers are constantly present and take part in the life of the family. Therefore the relation between fathers and descendants is mutual. Just as the blessing of the fathers is inherited by the sons, in the same manner the greatness of the sons reacts upon the fathers." I-II, op.cit., p. 276.

also likened unto a vine casting forth its fruit until it is left empty (Hos. 10:1; cf. Ps. 80:8ff.).¹ Throughout, the continuity of Israel is seen in its organic form, the undivided relationship between father and son.

The son shared in the blood of his father and was at the same time the recipient of his life.² The offspring inherits the solemn duty of extending and expanding this living treasure. This expansion was viewed as akin to the development of a great tree from a single seed.³ All this goes to explain the fundamental consideration which was attached to the individual's pedigree. At the same time it explains why guilt spread to the son, or why the family was conditioned by the welfare of the father.

2. The Factor of Acquirement. - Important as heredity was to the solidarity of the nation, the unity of the group did not wholly rest on that basis. Co-equal with the bond of a birth-relationship, was the conception of entrance into the community through acquiring a spiritual relationship.⁴ Just as the pure Israelite by birth was always liable to extirpation from the community because of contempt for its religious legal restrictions, so the alien by submitting to rites of initiation and keeping the statutes of Israel, was made a part of the corporate whole. Because in the final analysis the unity of Israel was a

¹Cf. further, C.K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," J.T.S., Vol. 48, 1947, p. 164.

²We agree with the opinion of A.B. Davidson that the Old Testament prefers Traducianism to Creationism, later adopted by the Rabbis. Cf. The Theology of the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 226.

³Note Gen. 7:3, where Noah's preservation of the stock is denoted as keeping "seed alive," and 9:19, where it is said of the sons of Noah, "... of them was the whole earth overspread."

⁴This chapter gives some illustrations of the conception of the corporate personality of the group or of an individual extended through relationship alone. Thus, the servant was an extension of his master, the worshipping community of its priest, and the nation of its king. Probably the best example is the union of marriage which makes of husband and wife "one flesh", i.e. one personality (Gen. 2:24f.). A.R. Johnson's The Vitality of the Individual has presented a great deal of relevant material. Cf. op.cit., passim.

religious dogma,¹ the spiritual foundation of her solidarity in practice took precedence over the generic. Thus, divine election of the nation through the covenant reacted against the exclusiveness of a kin-group. In return a deeper sense of solidarity instituted by God took its place, which formed the basis of the conception of the remnant. At the same time the majority of the nation is declared by the Lord through Hosea to be beyond the point of recall (1:6), the remnant of Judah is spared (1:7).² In the end, the whole will be restored, "... And I will say to them (i.e. Israel) which were not my people, Thou are my people" (Hos.2:23). It was the same covenant which welded the "mixed multitude" which came out of Egypt with the seed of Abraham that continued to guarantee the existence of the nation. It was the same covenant into which the proselyte by sharing the realistic experience of Israel's redemptive history, the renunciation of all religious ties, and circumcision, was incorporated, to make him one with the organic unity of Israel.

3. The Place of the Individual in the Community. - We must add one word to clarify the conception of the individual in the corporate group. To say that the one was subordinate to the many and that the individual was merged in and emerged from his unit for better or for worse,³ is to lay oneself open to serious misinterpretation. This is particularly true because of the modern development of totalitarianism in a fascist or a communist dress. In actuality the ancient and modern philosophies are poles apart. The Old Testament nowhere denies the supreme dignity and value of the individual. He is created in the "image and

¹Cf. S. Hanson, op.cit., p. 11.

²Cf. C.H. Paterson, op.cit., p. 87. For the Old Testament basis for the doctrine of the remnant, see F.W. Dillistone, op.cit., p. 30, Wm. Robinson, op.cit., pp. 30f. and R.L. Hicks, "The Jewish Background to the New Testament Doctrine of the Church," A.T.R., Vol. 30, 1948, pp. 109f.

³Cf. R.A., op.cit., p. c; S. Mowinckel, V, op.cit., p. 36.

likeness" of God (Gen. 1:26, 9:6, cf. Ps. 8:4), and enjoys the prerogatives of justice and private property (Deut. 24:16).¹ Far from being the super-imposed unity of a police state, the solidarity of Israel was a socio-religious phenomenon. The individual was free to remain within its orbit or exclude himself from it.

The cohesive element of the community was love (Lev. 19:18),² and a mutual reverence for God Who had sealed the destiny of the nation by a gracious covenant (וְיָהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד, Deut. 7:9,12; cf. I Kings 8:23. Neh. 1:5, 9:32). The individual was therefore created for society, which is a denial of abstract individualism.³ At the same time it is a misrepresentation to suppose that individualism was unknown prior to the time of the great prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel.⁴ The patriarchs, the great personalities of Israelite history, were individuals par excellence, as were the heads of families.

Personal responsibility is throughout the Old Testament, the basis of a conception of just retribution. In instances where the laws of group solidarity subordinated the individual to the group, there apparently was a recognition of a final law which decreed that the innocent are to be punished with the guilty.⁵ For the Israelite, this was no denial of justice, but the evidence of a new

¹Cf. G.G. Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. G.E. Day, New York, 1883, p. 146; W.A. Irwin, The Old Testament: Keystone of Human Culture, op.cit., pp. 67f.

²C.H. Paterson, op.cit., p. 89. Cf. H.C. King, Theology and the Social Consciousness, New York, 1902, pp. 20ff.; L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 236, n.67.

³G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., p. 47.

⁴Cf. H.H. Rowley, The Re-discovery of the Old Testament, Philadelphia, 1946, pp. 148,210.; C.R. Smith, op.cit., p. 78; O.S. Rankin, op.cit., pp. 9,14,53f., 85. E.C. Rust, op.cit., p. 115 and references; A. Lods, "Les Antécédents de la Notion d'Eglise," op.cit., p. 31; A. Causse, Israël et la Vision de l'Humanité, Strasbourg-Paris, 1924, p. 20.

⁵See Montefiore's discussion in R.A., op.cit., p. c, and G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., p. 24.

dimension resulting in the intensification of the seriousness of every thought and action in a divinely governed world. He recognized that dissociation from the past generations is both an impossible and ridiculous task. Rather, Israel chose the opposite course, submitting to the transcendent unity of the theocracy; The freedom of individualism was made subservient to a mission. The prophets illustrate this point vividly for they recognize the solidarity of Israel but condemn the evil in her as they seek to promote Israel's divinely appointed raison d'être. Thus, freedom to endorse or to repudiate the corporate unity into which the Israelite was born found its voluntary expression in the endorsement of Israel's mission. In periods of spiritual decline, the unifying bond of the covenant was correspondingly weak. The ideal state of the nation on the other hand was one of shalom, "peace harmony". In the Old Testament shalom existed when the blessing of God permeated the group. The individual must be more than well integrated personally; he must also be in harmony with the other members of the Community, "each soul giving and receiving to the extent that it is able. The whole community of souls further being led forward to complete harmony by the strong influence of the one who pervades the group."¹

¹G.A.F. Knight, op.cit., pp. 178f. Cf. L. Köhler, op.cit., p. 236, n.58; G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op.cit., pp. 51f. Note the parallel emphasis that A.R. Johnson gives to the conception of Sedek which was vicariously procured by the king. "The Key to life is Sedek or righteousness, the loyal functioning of the corporate whole." "The Role of the King ..." op.cit., pp. 105ff.

CHAPTER II

EARLY JEWISH CONCEPTIONS OF THE

SOLIDARITY OF THE HUMAN RACE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter, in accordance with the stated method of procedure outlined in the Introduction, is to present a brief but comprehensive examination of the conceptions of group solidarity current in Judaism in the period between the later prophets and the compilation of the Babylonian Talmud. The late composition of the latter suggests its inadequacy for propounding the opinions of Jewish Rabbis who lived in the first century. To a certain extent, the danger is real, because there are profound changes in Rabbinic thought following the rise of Christianity. Besides this problem, the disagreement amongst the Rabbis, is itself a difficulty which needs to be reckoned with.¹ This problem may be disposed of to a large extent by concentrating on those areas in which there is general agreement. There is the further point which we maintain: in the case of parallel or identical ideas, some relationship between Paul and Judaism may be correctly assumed. The actual presentation of this relationship will be taken up in Part Two.

¹As C.H. Dodd notes, "Within the field of rabbinic discussion there was a large amount of tolerated difference of opinion." Mysterium Christi, ed. G.K.A. Bell and D.A. Deissmann, London, 1931, p. 55. The most acceptable key to the rabbinic mind is supplied by M. Kadushin in the principle of "organic thinking." He warns at the outset that it is a serious mistake to force the statements of the Rabbis to yield a "theology of Judaism," if by such we understand a system of thought based on logic alone. Cf. Organic Thinking, New York, 1938, *passim*; so also F. Gavin, The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments, London, 1928, p. 6. Much that the Rabbis say is characterized by impressionistic intentions rather than any idea of laying down logical dogma. To borrow a choice phrase from N.P. Williams, the haggadic literature is characterized by "mythopoeic motif" rather

The four general literary sources from which our knowledge of Jewish thought comes are of unequal value for this discussion. This inequality corresponds to the influence which the groups who produced our extant sources may be assumed to have had on the Apostle. Because Paul's upbringing and education were in the hands of Rabbinic Pharisaism (cf. Philippians 3:5ff. and Acts 22:3),¹ the speculation and tradition of the Rabbis must be given first consideration.² The "extraneous," or "outside,"³ books (comprising the Apocrypha [with the possible exception of Ecclesiasticus] and Pseudepigrapha) must be given almost a comparable position with the haggadic literature of Judaism. The distinction made between "normative" and "extraneous" literature refers to their content and esteem⁴ rather than to any specific groups within Judaism which accepted one or the other. When G.F. Moore speaks of apocalyptic speculation as peripheral to the main current of Judaism,⁵ he is referring correctly to a select area of

than a reasoned intellectual theory. The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin, London, 1927, p. 75. Contrast Bousset who attributes the dis-unity of thought in Judaism as a whole in the late Hellenistic period to the interaction of new and old and the particularly effective principle of religious syncretism, rather than to a particular mode of thought. Die Religion des Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 3rd ed. rev. and ed. by Gressmann, Tübingen, 1926, pp. 472f.

¹B.W. Bacon claims that Pharisaism was the most important single formative influence in Paul's early life. The Story of St. Paul, Boston, 1904, pp. 23f. W.D. Davies presents a most acceptable refutation of that branch of scholarship which contends that Hellenistic thought and practice is the primary source of Paul's theology. Op. cit., pp. 1ff.

²H. St. John Thackeray reverses this order of importance, placing the Palestinian Apocryphal literature in the first place, Rabbinic influence second, and Alexandrian thought last in Paul's background, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, London, 1900, p. 11; Thackeray's reason for listing the sources in this order is because of the difficulty we must encounter in ascertaining first century Rabbinic opinion.

³Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, New York, 1949, p. 60, on this classification.

⁴Cf. W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box, Religion and Worship of the Synagogue, London, 1907, p. 41.

⁵Cf. Judaism, op. cit., vol. I, 127ff.; See also vol. II, 281. L. Ginsberg, "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings," J.B.L., vol. 41, 1922, pp. 115ff, indicates a similar

Jewish opinion and more specifically to that which was expressed subsequent to the Fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Second Temple. R.H. Charles and C.C. Torrey agree that in general point of view, as well as in their unreserved recognition of the Law, both types of literature are coincident.¹ It was precisely consequent to the exaltation of the Law which essentially made all apocalyptic writing after the third century B.C. pseudepigraphic. The supremacy of the Law excluded the possibility of a successful challenge from prophecy.² But the influence of apocalyptic thought is found even in the bona fide writings of the strict haggadic and halachic tradition.³

The importance of Jewish apocalyptic speculation in Paul's background cannot be adequately judged by a simple regard for the little use which he makes of it by direct reference in the Epistles. F.C. Porter, for example, has emphasized the absence of the apocalyptic term "Son of Man" along with the failure to adduce support for the parousia from the book of Daniel, to found a contention that Paul had little interest in such writings (even though canonical).⁴ But the close affinities between Pauline teaching and Jewish Apocalyptic exist, provoking an opinion from C.C. McCown, that his eschatology is his most distinctive Jewish trait.⁵ Possibly Schweitzer's contention that the "extraneous" elements of

opinion. With the exception of Daniel, the preservation of the literature is exclusively due to the efforts of the early Church. Ibid. p. 116. Cf. G.H.C. Macgregor and A.C. Purdy, Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ, New York, 1936, p. 52.

¹Cf. R.H. Charles, A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. II, p. vii and C.C. Torrey, J.E., Vol. I, op. cit., p. 673; also J. Bright, op. cit., p. 171; L. Ginsberg, op. cit., p. 134 n.7.

²R.H. Charles, A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. II, p. viii.

³For an introduction to Rabbinic writings see, H.L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, Philadelphia, 1931. More concise but adequate are the discussions of R.T. Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, London, 1903, pp. 1-33; Oesterley and Box, op. cit., chs. iii, and iv.

⁴"The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul," J.B.L., Vol. 41, 1922, pp. 188f. Cf. L. Ginsberg, op. cit., for a similar attitude on the part of the Rabbis.

⁵C.C. McCown, Munera Studiosa, ed. M.H. Shepherd and S.H. Johnson, Cambridge, Mass., 1946, in T.S. Kepler, Contemporary Thinking About Paul, New York, 1950, p. 117.

Jewish speculation were the most influential in forming Paul's thought,¹ is an extreme viewpoint; however, it is receiving increasing acceptance among New Testament scholars.² It is our assumed position that the concurrent intermingling of the traditional and Apocalyptic speculation in Palestine during the first century makes it both impossible and unnecessary to discriminate finally between the two types of material. Particularly on the question of the solidarity of Israel, do we find little difference in the two categories.

The third type of literature, which in itself cannot be a valuable source of Pauline thought, is the esoteric writings of a religious sect of Judaism. The Community of the New Covenant consisted of dissenters from orthodox Pharisaic-Rabbinism,³ and flourished shortly before the advent of Christ. They produced the recently discovered Dead Sea Scrolls and the Zadokite Documents, which although providing numerous parallels to New Testament thought, are difficult to assess as a source which reflects an influence on Paul. There is little or no reason to think that the Apostle had access to this literature, or had any direct dealings with the group which produced them. Parallels will be cited in the interest of comparison primarily, rather than as source material.

A fourth type of literature belonging to a well-defined class is the product of the Jewish Hellenistic school with its headquarters in Alexandria. Philo is

¹St. Paul and His Interpreters, trans. W. Montgomery, London, 1912, p. 241.

²Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 10. The best explanation for Paul's affinity with the Apocalyptic tradition is his connection with the Primitive Church.

³B.J. Roberts notes that, "Attempts to identify the dissenters with Essenes or Ebionite Christians or again, early Karaites or Sadducees are still only partially successful, and because the case for all these parties can be presented more or less plausibly, it must be concluded that the evidence for any definitive identification is still lacking." "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament Scriptures," Reprint from the B.J.R.L., Vol. 36, 1, Sept. 1953, p. 75. The absence of the term "Son of Man," from the scrolls is significant in arguing against any Christian connection. Ibid., p. 82.

the chief representative of this school, and is accountable for a peculiar type of syncretistic Jewish literature. But here again, Paul gives no certain indication of having heard of this Alexandrian religious philosopher, or having read any of his works.¹ Although the English-speaking world has more or less uncritically accepted Pauline dependence on the Hellenistic Wisdom of Solomon,² and possible knowledge of the Hellenistically flavored book of 4 Maccabees and the Letter of Aristeas, it is not a proven fact.³

A fifth category, and a sixth, of more or less importance to us, are the Works of Josephus (a Jewish historian of the first century), and discussions of Christians with Jews (e.g., the Dialogue with Trypho). But these are of minor importance for various reasons such as the bias or intention of the author; consequently they will receive only a minimum of treatment in this discussion.

The adopted procedure in this chapter is to present 1) the Jewish self-consciousness of the solidarity of Israel reflected both in direct statements and in metaphorical analogy, 2) the symbols of Jewish unity, 3) the idea of Israel's organic continuity, 4) the conception of solidarity evinced in the demands made upon aliens wishing to join the Community, 5) the implications of solidarity in the transferability of merit and demerit. The second part of the chapter will deal with the conceptions of the solidarity of the race through creation and the corporate guilt of the race.

¹I Cor. 15:45 has been cited as a polemic against Philo's doctrine of the heavenly and earthly man, but the evidence is inconclusive. See W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 52, and literature.

²E.g. S. Holmes who claims that it was undoubtedly used by Paul. A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. I, 521. So also B.W. Bacon, op. cit., p. 33, C.C. McCown, op. cit., p. 119. See W.D. Davies' discussion, op. cit., pp. 28f.

³The argument is based on inconclusive data, with too much emphasis placed on parallels and too little on the community of thought between them.

The Jewish Self-Consciousness of the

Solidarity of Israel

The Unity of Israel in Direct Statements and Analogy

1. Direct Reference to the Unity of Israel. - To post-Biblical Judaism, the unity of Israel was an unassailable proposition. Because this truth was of a fundamentally presuppositional character, there are few direct statements to be found to confirm so self-evident a truth. The aphorism which Josephus quotes, *θεὸς γὰρ εἷς καὶ τὸ ἑβραίων γένος ἓν*,¹ is actually didactic information for a non-Jewish audience. There is a claim referring to the unity of the nation in the 'Amida for Sabbath Vespers, "Thou are one, Thy Name is one, who is one in the world as Thy people Israel".² The emphasis on the oneness of the People of Israel in these statements indicates the presuppositional character of this dogma, in that it compares this truth to the one dogma of Judaism, namely, the unity of God.

The unity of the nation was founded by the divine election and sealed by the irrefragable covenant, which guaranteed that Israel should be one as long as there were two Israelites left. These were familiar ideas in the Old Testament period, but they had a new urgency in the post-exilic period; they were produced by the calamities which befell Israel. Thus, although individualism became more pronounced with the dispersion following the Exile (through Hellenistic influence), a reaction against these disrupting influences tended to solidify

¹Jewish Antiquities, Bk. iv, 201 (Classical Loeb ed., Vol. IV, 572)

²The Authorized Jewish Daily Prayer Book, ed. I. Singer, 9th ed., London, 1912, p. 175. Cf. A.E. Suffrin, "God", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J. Hastings, Edinburgh, 1913, Vol. VI, 295. Cf. also 4 Ez. 5.28; Suk. 55b; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 11. I. Abrahams makes a significant point in regard to the Shema; a feature of the daily Temple service (M. Tam. 5.1). As four verses of the Hebrew Scriptures begin with the invocation, "Hear, O Israel," and all occur in Deuteronomy (5:1, 6:4, 9:1, 20:3), a difference in word order was readily noticed in the confessional statement (6:4) in which the first person is used

the feeling of community among all the Sons of Abraham.¹

The absorbing fear of Judaism was that it should be dissolved as a people, and the mission of Israel to declare the truth of monotheism to the world would be at an end. This fear was counteracted by the eschatological hope of the complete restoration of the nation and the destruction of all paganism in the Messianic Age. It was this restoration with which the Jewish concept of salvation and final unity of the dispersed People of God was united.² In the meantime, the goal of existence was found for a Hebrew in not "severing himself from the Community," but joining in the common effort to prepare the nation for the Messiah's advent.

Many problems were encountered in the establishment of the solidarity of Israel both in the actual fact and in its theoretical definition. Among these were the problems of corporate justice, as opposed to the responsibility of the individual. There was a recognized tension between the future exaltation of Israel and the present crushing burden of slavery to Gentile dogs. There was the practical problem of association with the "nations" and the danger of mixed marriage. There was the question of the inclusion of the Gentile convert into the Community and his subsequent status. We shall encounter many more as we proceed. It is enough to note that all of these problems and conflicts have their roots in the conception of the unity of Israel and a desire to maintain a national identity.

2. The Jewish Teaching on the Unity of Israel by Metaphorical Analogy. - The fact of Israel's unity is often expressed through the medium of analogy. An

rather than the second. "The Lord our God the Lord is one," was understood as a personal acknowledgement by Israel and a proclamation to the nations. This is the earliest example of a creedal statement of a doctrine, having its origin as far back as the period of the Hasmonean revival. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 2nd Series, Cambridge, 1924, pp. 18ff.

¹See W.D. Davies on the tension between universalism and nationalism, op. cit., pp. 59ff. Cf. A. Cohen, Everyman's Talmud, London, 1932, pp. xvf.; N. Levison, The Jewish Background of Christianity, Edinburgh, 1932, pp. 186f.

²Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 312ff.

almost innumerable series of metaphors and similes represent Israel throughout the Talmud and Midrash. R. Simeon b. Yohai likens Israel to a body and soul. "If one of them sinned, they are all of them punished."¹ The primary emphasis of this Rabbi is not on a single life that pervades Israel, but he is simply drawing an analogy between the indivisible body and soul and using it to express the Jewish conception of the solidarity of the nation. R. Hezekiah b. Hiyya, evinces the same intention in using the simile of a sheep to describe the mysterious unity of Israel. Just as a lamb beaten on the head or on one of its limbs feels it in all the parts of the body, likewise is it with Israel. If one of them sins, all of them feel it.² According to R. Jose, the Galilean, until the last Israelite had finished his paschal sacrifice, the whole nation was in danger of obliteration.³ Throughout, in the exposition of the events of Israel's history, there is this emphasis on the dire implications of one Israelite failing to fulfil his role as a sub-unit of the national unit.

To this intent the writer of the Testament of Zebulun challenges Israel to unite through comparing her with a mighty river. "Observe, therefore, the waters, and know when they flow together, they sweep along stones, trees, earth and other things; but, if they are divided into many streams, the earth swalloweth them up, and they vanish away. So shall ye also be if ye be divided."⁴

¹Quoted by S.S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, London, 1909, p. 191, from Mechilta de-R. Simon B. Jochai, ed. Hoffmann, Frankfurt a Main, 1905, p. 95.

²Lev. R., 4.6, Mek. II, 205f. Cf. A. Marmorstein, The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature, London, 1920, pp. 68, 187. For the side use of pastoral imagery, see A. Feldman, The Parables and Similies of the Rabbis, Cambridge, 1924, ch. xii. In the fourth section of the Book of Enoch, Israel is depicted as a flock of sheep, but Gentile oppressors are wild animals of all descriptions. Cf. Lev. R., 1.3.

³Mek. I, 94.

⁴Ch. 9.1f. Cf. I Enoch 89:51, where the picture is drawn of Israel as a flock of straying sheep.

Here, one may note, that even the continuity of Israel itself, is dependent upon the subscription of the members of the nation to their divinely destined unity. It is contrary to nature for a creature to have more than one head,¹ is the type of proof that the writers of Early Judaism adduce to indicate the fundamental unity of the Chosen race.

The metaphorical employment of the figure of a tree, was a particularly choice manner of referring to Israel.² This metaphor was ideal for describing the unity and continuity of the Community. In one such parable, a point is made regarding the inefficiency of inexperienced men who attempt to destroy Israel, but fail because they only lop off the branches. But Balaam ("the wicked one"), being a man of experience, uncovered the roots and purposed to sever them. That is why he said, "Why should I curse every single tribe? rather root out the whole." Setting to work he found them (i.e. Israel) too hard to uproot.³

The continuity of Israel is clear in R. Eleazar b. Pedath's explanation of Genesis 12:3, "And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The Holy One, blessed be He, said unto Abraham, Two good shoots have I to engraft on thee, Ruth the Moabite and Naomi, the Ammonite.⁴ The willow tree spoke of the collective responsibility of Israel:

As the willow has neither taste nor smell, so (are) the Israelites who have neither Torah nor good works. What is God to do with them? It is not possible to destroy them. God says, 'Bind all together into one bundle, and the one will atone for the other.'⁵

A similar opinion was held regarding the bunch of hyssop employed to smear blood on

¹Test. Zeb. 9.4.

²For the prominence of the metaphorical use of trees, see A. Feldman, op. cit., chs. III ff. Cf. Wis. of Sol., 4.4f.

³Num. R., 20.19. In Jubilees 17.9, 21.22, to destroy a nation is to uproot it.

⁴Yeb. 63a. Cf. Baba Kama 38a. It is due to the merit of Ruth and Naomi, that Moab has been preserved.

⁵Lev. R., 30.12. Cf. F. Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I, London, 1939, p. 57.

the door-posts and lintels of Israel's houses in the Passover ceremony. The blood was a reminder of the three Patriarchs, but the lowly hyssop symbolized the People of Israel - lowly, yet bound together by the grace of God.¹

Out of the numerous examples of a vine representing Israel, there is one which is significant in that it illustrates the conception of an organic unity which existed from the Patriarchs down through the entire history of the nation. The vine (which is Israel), "while it is itself fresh and green" (i.e. alive) is "supported by dry stakes" (i.e. the dead fathers and their accumulated merit).² It is possible to draw the inference which Sanday and Headlam do in describing the Jewish conception of the solidarity of Israel in terms of an organic body, the members of which were closely bound together.³ The normally disruptive factor of death was transcended in the perception of the unit, Israel, which traversed all generations and included all the descendants of Jacob.

Israel is also depicted as the rose which bloomed in the orchard of the world. This orchard had been overgrown with thorns and briars, and fully deserved the destruction which God would have brought, had He not noticed this rose and smelt it when He delivered the Decalogue. "When Israel exclaimed, 'We will do and hear' (Ex. 24:7), the Holy One, blessed be He, said, 'For the sake of this rose shall the orchard be spared, and by the merit of the Torah and Israel shall the world be saved.'"⁴ The rose itself is not only a unit, but it is pictured as existing when the orchard itself was worthless. Because Israel was, to the Jewish teachers, and organic unity, it was no objection to their system of thought to recognize that

¹Cf. T.H. Gaster, op. cit., p. 49.

²Lev. R., 36.2. For the Rabbinic use of the symbolism of the vine, see A. Feldman, op. cit., ch. iv.

³The Epistle to the Romans, I.C.C., Edinburgh, 1895, p. 331. C.G. Montefiore and H. Loewe say, "The individual Israelite is a portion of the living organism which we know as the community." R.A., op. cit., p. 225.

⁴Lev. R., 23.3. See A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 66.

only one or two generations (the generations of Moses and Ezra; cf. Deut. 31:9ff. with Nehemiah 8:1ff.) formally accepted the Torah. During the course of Israel's history, not only had the Torah been so neglected that it was practically unknown in the period prior to the reign of Josiah, but it was repeatedly repudiated by the wicked kings of Judah. The Fathers had made the all-important decision of accepting the Law while the Gentile nations did not,¹ somehow binding the successive generations of Israel to the original decision irrespective of their own wills or actions. It was the Jewish conception of the unity and continuity of the national entity which made this proposition plausible. But the continuity of the nation was dependent upon its unity. A quotation from S. Schechter will further support this point:

Yet, notwithstanding all these relapses, one great end was achieved, and this was, that there existed a whole people who did one select God as their king. Over the people as a whole, as already hinted, God asserts his right to maintain his kingdom. Thus, the Rabbis interpret Ezekiel 20:33, "Without your consent and against your will I (God) shall be King over you;" and when the elders of Israel remonstrate, "We are now among the Gentiles, and have therefore no reason for not throwing off the yoke of his kingdom," the Holy One answers, "This shall not come to pass, for I will send my prophets, who will lead you back under my wings." The right of possession is thus enforced by an inner process, the prophets being a part of the people; and so there will always be among them a remnant which will remain true to their mission of preaching the kingdom.²

The emphasis placed on the Torah and its importance for the constitution of the unit Israel, was the source of an insoluble tension between the concept of the unity of Israel and its moral integrity. This conflict may be seen in the interpretation of Song of Songs, 2:13, "The fig tree putteth forth her green figs," and

¹Cf. Ex. R., 27.9; 47.3, "If it were not for my Law which you accepted, I should not recognize you, and I should not regard ^{you} more than any of the idolatrous nations of the world." Cf. R.A., op. cit., pp. 77ff., 116, 121.

²Op. cit., p. 88. Cf. references ad loc., and A. Bückler, op. cit., p. 117.

its application to Israel. It was given a historical setting in the three days of darkness (in Egypt) during which, it was claimed, the wicked of Israel perished.¹ It is important to note that this type of midrash reflects a continuity with the exclusivism of the Old Testament, limiting the understanding of Israel to the righteous remnant, large or small.² As long as Israel was recognized by the Rabbis as a moral unity,³ a theocratic nation, with the glory of God its sole purpose of existence, they were forced to accept the conclusion that the wicked of Israel were removed from the transcendent Community. The wicked by their evident rejection of the divine rule, alienate themselves from Israel. Although conflicting opinions were expressed, the idea is to be found of a "true Israel," apart from a national Israel. Thus, for example, R. Jehuda is claimed to have said, "'Ye are sons of the Lord your God' (Deut. 14:1). If you behave as sons, you are called sons; if you do not behave as sons, you are not called sons."⁴ R. Hiyya explained Ecclesiastes 9:5, as a reference to the "wicked who in their lifetime are called dead."⁵ Although this distinction between the people of God and Jewry is frequently encountered,⁶ a contrary opinion

¹Cant, R., 2.13. See W.D. Davies for other references, op. cit., p. 338, and p. 84. This writer thinks this passage teaches the exclusion of the wicked from the resurrection. Ibid., p. 84. For a definitive discussion of the Rabbinical use of the metaphor of the fig tree, see A. Feldman, op. cit., ch. v.

²H. Loewe points out that, "There is a frequent contrast or rather a sort of see-saw between the ideal Israel - Israel as it should be, and, as represented by its martyrs and righteous men, it even is - and the Israel of fact, too often sinful and negligent of its supreme duty." R.A. op. cit., p. 94. Cf. Men. 53b.

³That the Rabbis unquestionably held this opinion is supported by much of the Early Jewish literature. Note for example Mek. III, 9f, 163f. Love for one another is implicit in the concept of Israel and the Hebrew slave must fare as well as his master. Cf. further A. Büchler, op. cit., pp. 106ff.

⁴Cf. M.M. Bourke, A Study of the Metaphor of the Olive Tree in Romans XI, Washington, 1947, pp. 16ff.

⁵Ber. 18b.

⁶Cf. M. Pirke Aboth 5.19; Gen. R. 53.12; H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament as Talmud und Midrasch, Vol. III, München, 1926,

is registered by the prominent R. Meir to the effect that whether they (Israel) carry on as children or not, they are always children.¹ The section ten of Mishna Sanhedrin states categorically that, "All Israel has a part in the world to come."² There is no possible reconciliation of the opinions which we have considered regarding the wicked and those who failed to observe the Torah apart from the conception of solidarity. The solution of a corporate merit which would atone for the sinners so that all Israel might be saved was a popular conclusion as we shall see (*infra*). The very seriousness with which the problem of the inclusion or exclusion of the wicked from Israel was discussed, is a significant commentary on the self-consciousness of the unity of Israel.

Another metaphor which was a great favorite for the designation of Israel in Early Judaism was divine sonship.³ Israel is the "son of God." This was a title taken over from the Old Testament and used to emphasize the superior position of the Chosen People over all other nations. Ecclesiasticus' prayer requesting compassion on the people called by God's name, refers to Israel as him, "whom Thou didst surname Firstborn."⁴ The writer of the Wisdom of Solomon claims that

pp. 124f. The idea is also found in 4 Ez. 7:75-87 and 2 Baruch 30.4. Some Rabbis exclude whole segments of Israelites. For example R. Eleazar said, "Those who die outside of Palestine will not live again, The Amme-ha-Aretz will not live again. Whoever is slack about Torah will not live again." Ket. 111b. Cf. R.A., *op. cit.*, p. 600; G. Johnston, *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament*, Cambridge, 1943, p. 21.

¹Kid. 36a. Cf. Hagigah 27a where the wicked are typified by the golden Altar. Although the fire (i.e. Gehinnom) burned upon it for many years it could not affect it. R. 'Abba b. Zabda says, "An Israelite, even though he has sinned, remains an Israelite." Sanh. 44a. Cf. R.A. *op. cit.*, p. 240.

²M. Sanh. 10.1. Later in the same section the names of three kings and four commoners are listed as excluded from the world to come. The Tosefta on the other hand, reckons that the sinners of Israel and those of the nations are worthy of equal punishment, viz., twelve months in Gehinnom following which they were turned to dust and scattered. For the *Minim* (heretics) and apostates, etc., a much more prolonged period of suffering was determined. Cf. Sanh. 13.4,5; R.T. Herford, *op. cit.*, pp. 119f.

³M.-J. Lagrange considers this to be one of the most admirable features of Rabbinical Judaism. *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1931, p. 461. Cf. R.A., *op. cit.*, p. 72; Bousset, *op. cit.*, pp. 377ff.

⁴36.12. Cf. 44.22 and Jubilees 2.20, 4 Ez. 6.58.

the Egyptians at the time of their destruction confessed Israel to be the son of God.¹ One need but consider the prayer of R. Akiba ("Our Father, our King, we have no King but Thee. Our Father, our King, for Thy sake have mercy upon us"²), or one of the early petitions of Hebrew liturgy, addressed in the words, "Our Father, our King," to see that the Fatherhood of God and the sonship of Israel appears as a cardinal point.³

Illustrative of the intimate relationship which was maintained between God and Israel is a parable relating to a king's son who fell into evil ways. The King commended a message to him urging him to return; but, the son sent the reply: "With what can I return? I am ashamed to come before you." The father returned the answer: "Can a son be ashamed to return to his father? If you return, do you not return to your father?"⁴ Again, the privileged position of Israel is evident. Although it has fallen into nefarious ways, the relationship with God remains the same.⁵ Only the fellowship between the Father and son is disrupted. This honor was not self-imposed but was accorded to Israel through the divine will. "He has exalted me in Egypt," is referred to Israel, "as it is said: 'And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh: Thus saith the Lord: Israel is My son, My first born (Ex. 4:22)'"⁶ Even beyond the honor given Israel by this exalta-

¹18.13. Cf. 3 Macc. 6.28; Note, Pirkê de-R. Eliezer, trans. G. Friedlander, London, 1916, p. 326.

²Taanith 25b.

³Cf. Ber. 11b. This is according to S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 55, one of the most frequent designations of Israel in the Jewish Prayer Book and subsequent liturgy.

⁴Deut. R. 2.24. Cf. Ex. R. 46.5; and R.A., op. cit., p. 66.

⁵Thus, the Sifre on Deut. par. 308, states, "Even if they are foolish, even if they transgress, even if they are full of blemishes, they are still called 'Sons.'" J. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. H. Danby, London, 1925, p. 377. Cf. Kid. 36a.

⁶Mek. II, 12. Cf. also Jer. 3:4, 19.

tion, was the involvement in an unconditional responsibility. It was Israel's failure to implement its responsibility which invoked the divine chastisement and served proof of the unique adoption of Israel by God.¹

The metaphorical use of servanthood is comparatively rare in Early Jewish literature. The role of Israel depicted in Isaiah's Servant Songs and the Christian interpretation of its Messianic fulfillment caused Jewish interpretation of this passage consistently to attribute the figure to Israel collectively.² A quotation from Origen reveals that this opinion was held by his Jewish opponent. "These predictions bore reference to the whole people regarded as one individual as being in a state of dispersion and suffering, in order that many proselytes might be gained, on account of the dispersion of the Jews among numerous heathen nations."³ Particularly in times of national apostasy, did Israel find her cherished filial relationship to God changed to one of servanthood or slavery. "When they do not do His will, He rules over them as an owner rules over his slaves."⁴ Other passages paint a brighter picture, in which God is the majestic

¹Cf. S. Schechter with Sifre 73b, where, the writer teaches that the suffering sustained by Israel reconciled and attached the son to the Father. Note also Pirke de-R. Eliezer, op. cit., p. 326.

²This, although the most frequent interpretation of the Isaiah passage (cf. Osterley and Box, op. cit., p. 93), is not universal. The evidence examined by G.F. Moore indicates that less biased views on the identity of the Servant, held Isa. 53:12 might remind them of Moses or Phineas, and that the Targum on Isa. 52:13-15, was referred to the Messiah. Vol. III, op. cit., p. 166. H.L. Ginsberg is of the opinion that the very earliest interpretation of the Suffering Servant is made by Daniel in chapters 11f. The writer is supposed to have thought of the Maskilim (Enlightened or Enlighteners) as the fulfillment of the prophesy of Isaiah. Cf. "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant," Vetus Testamentum, Vol. III, Leiden, 1953, pp. 400ff. The classic discussion of the Jewish interpretation of the Suffering Servant is A. Neubauer and S.R. Driver, op. cit., passim.

³Contra Celsum, Bk. I, ch. 55. Cf. also Ex. R. 15.17; A Büchler, op. cit., p. 56.

⁴Ex. R. 24.1 Cf. Pes. Rab. 132b, "He deals with thee (Israel) as a slave." R.A., op. cit., p. 76 and references.

King and Israel is the retinue of divine royalty. The duty of Israel is to imitate the King.¹ By contrast the Gentiles are slaves who serve God out of fear and anxiety lest they should commit some fault; while Israel rejoices in her high station, the result of her free choice, and assured of God's leniency in her necessary correction.²

In all of these metaphors and similes, the corporate unity of Israel was implied.³ Even in the collective figures of sheep, branches of a tree, or nuts (cf. *infra*), the presupposition emerges that Israel is an integral unity.⁴ The individuals of Israel are sub-units of the transcendent totality of the Chosen Race. As the writer of 4 Ezra puts it, "Among all the multitudes of peoples,

¹Sifra to Num. 19:2. Cf. Baruch 3.37, Pss. of Sol. 17.23. Cf. A. Büchler, *op. cit.*, pp. 54, 59. For an exhaustive discussion of Israel's divine servanthood because she took upon herself the Torah at Sinai, see *ibid.*, pp. 36ff. In brief, "מלך and King are correlative terms, and the subject's obedience to any order of God is his submission to the King and Master's rule." *Ibid.*, p. 59.

²Cf. S. Schechter, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

³One interesting proof of this point is to be noted in the antagonism which Jesus aroused in His self-designation as the Son of God. (Cf. Jn. 10:33,36, Mk. 14:61, 63, and Matt. 24:64f.) By Jesus' claim to God as His Father, a unique relationship was invoked which the Pharisees could not overlook. But it was not involved in their own statement, "We have one Father, even God" (Jn. 8:41). See J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, *op. cit.*, p. 378. A.L. Williams, in a special study of this point concludes that there is extraordinarily little evidence of the use, "My Father," in addressing God, but it is not completely unknown (cf. Ecclus., 4.10, 23.1,4, Wisdom 2.16-18, and a few instances in the Rabbis). But these afford no real parallel to the usage which Jesus made of this expression. "'My Father' in Jewish Thought of the First Century," J.T.S., Vol. 31, 1930, pp. 42ff. For a definitive discussion of Jesus' self-designation, see G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, Edinburgh, 1902, pp. 280ff. There was another distinct sense in which the fatherhood of God was extended to all men as a result of the part the Creator played in the formation of each individual. The father provides white matter, the mother, the red, but the Holy One, "infuses into him breath, soul, features, vision, hearing, speech, power of motion, understanding, and intelligence." Nid. 31a. Josephus deduces that God is displeased with those who dishonor their parents because "He is Himself the Father of the whole race of mankind," and seems to bear part of that dishonor which falls upon those that have the same name. Jewish Antiquities, Bk. iv., 262 (Loeb Cl. Lib., Vol. IV, 602).

⁴Cf. C. Guignebert, *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus*, trans. S.H. Hooke, New York, 1939, p. 94; See S. Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

thou hast gotten thee one people" (5.27). The nature and implications of this unity will become increasingly evident as we proceed.

The Symbols of Israel's Unity

1. The Symbolism of the אֶרֶץ יְרֵאֵהוּ - There is a great deal of evidence in Early Jewish literature to support the contention that an inherent relation existed between Israel as a people and certain possessions accorded her by God through the covenant. These "gifts" belonged to Israel in a unique sense and thus formed symbols of the oneness of the seed of Abraham. In each instance, the roots of these symbols lie in the Old Testament, but received a curious emphasis and development in the teachings of the Rabbis. The first of these symbols is the Jewish conception of the "Land."

Preserving an ancient regard for the Promised Land, the Rabbis felt as strongly about the inseparable relationship between אֶרֶץ יְרֵאֵהוּ and the Chosen Race.¹ This regard is all too evident in a statement made by R. Eleazar, "Whoever is domiciled in the Land of Israel lives without sin, for it is said in Scripture, 'And the inhabitants shall not say, 'I am sick.''"² By contrast all the other lands of the world were deemed unclean.³ It was a natural Jewish supposition that the bodies buried in foreign lands would be defiled by contamination.

¹It is one of the precious gifts procured for Israel through suffering. Ber. 5a.

²Ket. 111a. The meritorious holiness of the Land of Israel was highly extolled. Note, e.g., R. Johanan who claimed that whoever so much as walked in the Land of Israel a distance of four cubits is assured a place in the world to come. Ket. 111a. In the rules governing the acceptance of Proselytes, those that affirm faith in the Land need no witness, while those outside Palestine, require a number of them. Cf. Gerim 4.3 (Mishna) with Yeb. 46b-47a. Dwelling in the Land outweighs the Mizwoth and Torah. Sifre 91b.

³Cf. Bousset's discussion, op. cit., p. 94; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 206.

tion. Other Rabbis emphasized that the extent of the resurrection would be limited to the borders of Palestine. This idea prompted R. Simai's explanation of the manner in which those Jews who were not privileged to be buried in Israel¹ would be brought to Palestine for the resurrection: "The Holy One, blessed be He, will burrow the earth before them and their bodies will roll through the excavation like bottles, and when they arrive at the land of Israel, their souls will be reunited with men."²

Because the Land is the locus of the Shekinah presence of God, those who dwell there understandably enjoy a closer proximity to God than those who dwell without.³ It is the Land of lands, the solstitial point of the earth,⁴ and lies higher than any other. It is not surprising to find that Palestine merits the title, "The Land of the Living"⁵. Credit is given to the Land for the

¹Note R. Anan's evaluation of burial in Palestine, "Whoever is buried in the Land of Israel is deemed to be (lit. 'as if') buried under the altar; since in respect to the latter it is said in Scripture, 'An altar of earth shalt thou make unto me' (Ex. 20:21), and in respect of the former it is written in Scripture, 'And his land doth make expiation for his people' (Deut. 32:43)." Ket. 111a. Cf. Ket. 111b, where the just rise in Jerusalem. The same opinion is registered in the Pirke de-R. Eliezer, in that all the souls of Israelites which die outside of the land are gathered into Israel. Op. cit., p. 255.

The ulterior motive underlying the emphasis on the Land must be noted in all fairness to the Rabbis. It was a concerted attempt to retain and create ties between all Jews. These statements were designed to produce a strong incentive for the Diaspora to attend the feasts and keep isolated Judaism alive. Cf. Bousset, op. cit., p. 71. The Rabbis were very much aware also of the integral relationship which the Old Testament established between the Seed of Abraham and the Land given to the Patriarch through the covenant. See further, S.A. Cook, The Old Testament; a Reinterpretation, op. cit., p. 120.

²Jer. T., Ket. par. 3f. 35b, line 13. Note the variations given by R. Elai and R. Abaye and Karma in Ket. 111a. This ingenious explanation was required, in their estimation, by the example of the Patriarchs, and Jacob in particular, who although righteous demanded burial in the Promised Land. Less fortunate succeeding generations required supernatural intervention. Cf. F. Weber, Jüdische Theologie, Leipzig, 1897, p. 369.

³Cf. F. Weber, System der altsynagogalen Palästininischen Theologie, Leipzig, 1880, p. 63.

⁴F. Weber, ibid., p. 64.

⁵Gen. R. 74.1.

continuation of the world's existence.¹

The symbolism of the Land of Israel for the unity of the dispersed of Israel was a particularly prominent element in Jewish eschatological speculation. The future was invested with the character of a glorious period in which the rule of God would be actualized in the Land and from thence extend to all the world even as the prophets had foretold.² The introduction of this period would be punctuated by the ingathering of the scattered members of Israel. Combined with the conception of the Messianic Kingdom, this feature, became normative in Jewish eschatology.³

When the Land had been restored to Israel, it would be cleansed⁴ and the heathen would be excluded, except for pilgrimages.⁵ The Messianic Age was also expected to realize the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple,⁶ but the universal holiness of Israel was determined to be the preceeding requirement.⁷ It was this necessity for an increased holiness which explained the temporary detainment of the exiles in Babylon and elsewhere.⁸ It is not infrequent

¹Deut. R. 2 passim.

²Note such passages as Isa. 11:1-16, 27:12f., 35:8f., 49:22, 60:4,9, 66:20, Mic. 7:12, Ezek. 39:27 and Zech. 10:6-11. Cf. A. Lods, "Les Antécédents de la Notion d'Eglise en Israël, op. cit., pp. 36, 43.

³Cf. Tobit 13.13, 14.5; Ecclus. 36.11; Pss. of Sol. 11 and 17. See Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 221.

⁴Pirke de-R. Eliezer, op. cit., pp. 255f. "The Lord will shake the land of Israel and cleanse it from all impurity." Cf. K. Kohler, "Eschatology," J.E., Vol. V, 215f.

⁵Cf. Pss. of Sol. 17.31, Jubilees 23.30, 50.5. This probably refers to the nations which survive since according to 2 Bar. 72.4, "Every nation that knows not Israel and has not oppressed the race of Jacob shall be spared." But note G.H.C. Macgregor and A.C. Purdy, op. cit., p. 131.

⁶2 Bar. 4.26. Cf. the Shemoneh 'Esreh petitions 14 and 17, and Lev. R. 9.6.

⁷See S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 114 and references.

⁸Cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., p. 63. Note the petition recited during the Passover, "This year we celebrate it here, may we celebrate it next year in the

to find passages that proclaim the conditional dawning of the Kingdom as dependent upon the perfect observation of the Sabbath or some aspect of the Law by all of Israel.¹ God would always abide by His covenant; therefore, if Israel would fulfil her duty, the exiles would be regathered, thus actualizing the physical unity of the whole seed of Abraham that they might unitedly enjoy the consolation of Zion.² Thus, the Land was not only a locus of Israelite citizenship, but a symbol of the idealistic conception of the regathered nation enjoying unlimited prestige over all the nations of the world with Jerusalem as the metropolis of a world-empire.³

2. The Symbolism of the Temple. - The external symbol⁴ of Israel's religious or spiritual unity was the Temple. On Mount Zion, the singular love of God for Israel was evinced in the abiding Presence.⁵

land of Israel. This year we are in exile, next year we may be free." A.A. Green, The Revised Hagada, London, 1898, p. 27 and p. 26, n.2, where there is an affirmation regarding the origin of this liturgy in the early days of the dispersion. In The Revised Hagada, pp. 53, 55, the hope is also expressed regarding the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem and the future partaking of the Passover following the divine redemption. Cf. Benediction 10 (of the Birkath ha-shanim) based on Isa. 11:11f., 17:13, "Sound the great horn of our freedom, and lift up the ensign to gather all our exiles from the four corners of the earth to our own land." W.O.E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, Oxford, 1925, p. 64.

¹Cf. e.g. Mek. II, 119f. The perfect observance of the Sabbath was organically related to the repose which God would proffer the nation in the restoration. Cf. A.A. Green, op. cit., p. 63. Since the Rabbis thought of the relationship between the Torah and Israel to be inherent (cf. Mek. II, 75f.), the perfect observance of the one involved the establishment of the other.

²See Bousset's discussion, op. cit., pp. 237ff.

³Cf. Ber. 49a. See F. Weber, Jüdische Theologie, op. cit., pp. 374ff. and S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 20 and references.

⁴See A. Cronbach's article, "New Studies in the Psychology of Judaism," H.U.C.A., Vol. 19, 1945-6, pp. 205ff., 207.

⁵Cf. Cant. R. 5.16; See F.V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, Leipzig, 1931, p. 10; G.A.F. Knight, op. cit., p. 92. For a more comprehensive

The significant uniqueness of the Sanctuary was not confined to the Land of Israel, but was expanded to centrality in the whole earth. Thus, the writer of Jubilees speaks of Mount Zion as the "center of the navel of the earth"

(8:19).¹ At the same time as it retained centrality in the earth on a horizontal level, it served as a unifying bond in a vertical direction.²

The Temple was a monument dedicated to the proposition that Israel served the one and true God, and in its service, "Israel found the communal satisfaction of its deepest and most vital impulse, and at least an illusion of national unity."³ With a quaint pedestrianism the Midrash compares Israel to a flock of sheep enjoined to make a hut for the shepherd (i.e. God), that He might come amongst them and provide for them.⁴ The same moral lies behind this extended metaphor:

discussion, note W.J. Phythian-Adams, The People and the Presence, Oxford, 1942, passim.

On this point also, a dissenting opinion is found in Pes. R. 160, "When the Temple was rebuilt, the Shekinah did not rest upon it. For God had said, 'If all the Israelites return the Shekinah shall rest upon it, but if not, they shall be served only by the Heavenly Voice (Bat Kol).'" R.A., op. cit., p. 16. This realization may have influenced the rise of the Synagogues. Cf. Macgregor and Purdy, op. cit., pp. 83ff.

¹Cf. Sib. Oracles, Bk. III, 573ff., 718, 772ff., where the Temple will have the respect of the whole world. See further, H. St. J. Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, 2nd ed., London, 1923, p. 67; F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 62, and Jüdische Theologie, op. cit., pp. 198ff.

²Cf. Sib. Or. V, 250, 420ff.; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 12. Along this line it is curious to note a passage in the Mishna which lists the progressive sanctity in holy places and areas. Israel is holier than any other land; the walled cities exceed in holiness the unwalled, and so on, until the radius is confined to the Holy of Holies which is the most sacred place of all. Kelim 1.6-9. Cf. 3 Macc. chaps. 1f. This regard for the Temple was a natural deduction from increased recognition of the immanence of God in the Holy Land and its center in the Temple. Cf. J. Abelson, The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, London, 1912, pp. 117ff.

³C. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, op. cit., p. 59.

⁴Ex. R. 34.3.

You are the vineyard and I am the watcher, make a tent for the watcher that he may guard you; you are the children and I am the father, - it is a glory for the father when he is with his children, a glory for the children when they are with their father; make therefore a house for the father that he comes and dwells with his children.¹

It is Bousset who has noted the priestly character of the nation in the period surrounding the turn of the era (note the mention of the courses of priests in Luke's account, 1:5ff). This factor alone is sufficient to explain the centrality of the nation Sanctuary in priestly community.² The myriads of rules and details governing the Temple ritual preserved in the Mishna and Gemara long after the Sanctuary had been razed, are a solemn proof of the importance the Temple had for Jewry. The severity of the blow to the nation incurred through the destruction of the Temple was only slightly ameliorated by the belief that this calamity provided atonement for Israel, in that the Sanctuary was destroyed in Israel's stead.³

The unifying element of the Temple cult for the whole of Judaism through the festival pilgrimage was of extensive significance. As in the days of the wilderness wandering, the people unitedly attended the sacrificial rites performed at the Tent of Meeting, it was the corporate entity of the nation that offered sacrifices in the Temple and received the blessing of God in return. As S. Hanson says, "In the cult the people appear as a jointly acting person, as a unity. And the communication of the individual with God takes place only through the people."⁴

3. The Symbolism of the Torah. - Granting that the Temple was the external spiritual symbol of Israelite unity, the internal religious symbol must be accorded to the Torah. Bousset is well aware of this point when he maintains that the Law

¹Ex. R. 34.3.

²Op. cit., pp. 97ff. Cf. Mek. II, 205; M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 293.

³Cf. Kid. 31b.; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends of the Jews, Vol. VI, Philadelphia, 1939, p. 398.

⁴Op. cit., p. 13. Cf. Oesterley and Box, op. cit., pp. 191ff., and G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 20.

overshadowed the Temple cult in its importance as a unifying element for all Israel.¹ There is a rationale behind the conception of the Torah as the bond uniting all Jews. As far back as the 6th century B.C., invading hordes of uncircumcized heathen had swarmed over the Land of Israel, destroying the Temple and ravaging the land, taking its inhabitants into captivity. Subscription to the Torah was a personal affair to a large extent, and not easily subjected to foreign interference. Thus, the importance of the Law was emphasized to ridiculous proportions culminating in the minutiae of legalistic detail for which the New Testament Pharisees are deservedly noted. At the same time, the Law became the object of Jewish allegiance. In the Rabbinic mind, the Torah was the creditable cause for the divine election of Israel to be the People of God,² consequently they deduced that not only her destiny to rule the world, but her very existence as a people depended on Israel's continued adherence to the Law. The Torah was the bond of community between God and Israel.³ Certainly, considering the period of Jewish history following the destruction of the Second Temple, Guignebert is correct in saying, "It was really the Torah that united the Jews not the Temple."⁴

In contrast with the Temple, the Torah was given unconditionally.⁵ An inherent bond unites the Torah and Israel.⁶ This direct revelation was experienced

¹Cf. Bousset, op. cit., pp. 97ff.

²Note e.g. Num. R. 14.10.

³F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 46. Thus one may read in 2 Bar. 48:22, "Thy law is with us, and we know that we shall not fall so long as we keep Thy statutes." Cf. R.H. Charles, A.P.O.T., Vol. II, op. cit., p. 491 n.5 on 2 Bar. 15.5.

⁴Op. cit., p. 59 n.3. Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., pp. 14, 43; Macgregor and Purdy, op. cit., p. 146. Note J. Bright's discussion of this point, op. cit., pp. 170ff.

⁵Cf. Mek. II, 188f.

⁶Cf. M. Kadushin, "Some Aspects of the Rabbinic Concept of Israel," H.U.C.A., Vol. 19, 1945-6, pp. 69f.

by the whole people, and at least in one sense converted the whole nation.¹ The giving of the Law, according to one anonymous source, depended on the solidarity of Israel, in that Israel would have been unworthy to receive it if one person had been absent.² It is the whole basis of Israel's unique position according to the writer of 2 Baruch, "For we are all one celebrated people, who have received one Law from One."³ In a typically Rabbinic manner, the Torah was personified as the heavenly bride, the daughter of the Holy One to whom Israel was wedded on the day of his revelation at Mount Sinai.⁴ Beyond being a happy husband, Israel enjoys the particular honor of being entrusted with the "desirable instrument through which the world was created."⁵ This instrument, the Torah, is the sum total of the will of God.⁶

Other sayings of the Rabbis emphasize the life-giving power of the Torah. "Great is the Torah which gives life to those that practise it in this world and in the world to come."⁷ As it was in the case of the Exodus redemption, the Law

¹Mek. II, 200. Cf. M. Kadushin, ibid., p. 68.

²Mek. II, 212f. Cf. M. Kadushin, ibid., pp. 95f.

³48.24. That such opinions had a leveling effect on Jewish society is undoubted. "Though they belong to different religious groups or different social strata of society, they all have the same position toward the Law." S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 15.

⁴Cf. Ex. R. 33.7; S.S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 130.

⁵M. Pirke Aboth 3.18. But the continued existence of the world was dependent upon the reception of the Torah by a nation. For this reason, it was kept in suspense until the day of its revelation, L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., I, 52.

⁶That is, the sum, in the sense that a seed is the sum of the plant. It was a standing principle of the Rabbis, that the words of the Torah "are fruitful and multiply." Cf. Hag. 3b.; S.S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 134.

⁷M. Pirke Aboth 6.7. Cf. Mek. II, 139, Num. R. 17.6. In Jub. 24.26f, the study of the laws and commandments results in a great increase in the length of life. See G.F. Moore, Vol. II, pp. 160f. and R.A., op. cit., pp. 118 and 672 n. 37, and Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 139.

was extracted from the sphere of belief and was projected into the sphere of personal experience. Kadushin remarks:

Each individual, according to the Rabbis, possesses the consciousness that the Mizwot (commandments) were laid by God on him personally; he who willfully violates a Mizwah deliberately denies God, rejects Him, rebels against Him. Furthermore, the giving of Torah, is not limited to any event of the past...It is concretized anew in enactments and teachings by the Rabbis themselves...felt to be authorized by God.¹

For this reason, the Rabbis depict the Torah as weighing Israel over to the side of merit and bringing them to the Life to Come.² In these ideas, the Old Testament emphasis on the covenant can be seen in reflection. As the covenant had called Israel into being, in Jewish speculation, without the Torah, Israel would cease to exist.³ It is Israel's raison d'etre; as it was in its beginnings, so it must remain through all time.⁴

With the unrelenting vigor with which the Jewish teachers emphasized the Torah in all of its extreme requirements, it is no wonder that the Law became the basic distinction between Jews and Gentiles tending to make Israel a nation apart. The Rabbis themselves promoted this exclusivism as a saying of the Fathers will illustrate. When a Rabbi was offered a million golden denarii to live in a Gentile city, he responded:

Were you to give me all the silver and gold and precious stones and pearls in the world, I would not dwell anywhere but in a home of the Torah; and thus it is written in the Book of Psalms by the hand of David, King of Israel, 'The law of Thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver' (Ps. 119:72); and not only so, but in the hour of man's departure neither silver nor gold nor precious stones nor pearls accompany him, but only Torah and good works.⁵

¹The Rabbinic Mind, New York, 1952, p. 366.

²Cf. M. Kadushin, Organic Thinking, op. cit., p. 17 and references.

³Ibid., p. 21.

⁴Cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., pp. 46f.; Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 145; Macgregor and Purdy, op. cit., p. 79.

⁵Pirke Aboth (Mishna) 6.9. Cf. A. Cohen, op. cit., pp. 138f.

More than promoting Jewish exclusivism alone, the emphasis on the Torah became a paramount factor in producing distinctions within Israel. Thus, although the Am-haaretz are presumably pure in race, because they did not practise the requirements of the Law, they are deprecated as the "refuse of the Community."¹ The Mishna goes the length of prohibiting the association of the Haberim (Associates)² with the Am-haaretz, "since help may not be given to them that commit transgression."³ Thus one may see a dialectical division within the racial ranks of Israel between the righteous and sinners.⁴ As S. Hanson points out, "The division between the pious and godless did not, as it appeared from a national-ethical point of view, correspond to a division between Israel and the Gentiles. Instead, this opposition pervades God's chosen people."⁵ On the other hand, the Gentile proselyte by accession to the demands of the Torah was viewed by orthodox Judaism in terms of brotherhood.⁶ This point will be discussed

¹Cf. M.P. Aboth 2.6, 5.10; Hul. 92a, Ber. 47b; R.A., op. cit., p. 183. The tension between the spiritual unity and racial privilege may be noted in that many passages include those whom the Pharisees called "this people who know not the law (and) are cursed" (Jn. 7:49), in the corporate reward of the nation. Cf. M. Kadushin, Organic Thinking, op. cit., p. 46; F. Jackson and K. Lake, op. cit., pp. 72f., H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, New York, 1949, pp. 33f.

²Those that undertook to observe the Law in full, H. Danby, The Mishnah, Oxford, 1933, p. 22 n.2. Cf. G.F. Moore, Vol. III, 26.

³Sheb. (Mishna), 5.9. Gittin (Mishna), 5.9.

⁴Cf. Bousset's discussion, op. cit., pp. 187f. and A. Lods, "Les Antécédents de la Notion d'Eglise," op. cit., p. 47.

⁵Op. cit., p. 16. Ecclus. 13.17, I Macc. 2.42, 44, Wisdom, 2.18, 4 Ez. 8.55ff. Yoma 86a declares that of him who studies the Torah, the Scriptures say, "And he said unto me: Thou art My Servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified;" (Isa. 49:3), but of him who studies the Torah but does not fulfil its demands the Scriptures say, "These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of his land," implying that they had rejected the Lord and severed themselves from the Community of Israel at the same time.

⁶Cf. W.G. Braude, Jewish Proselyting in the First Centuries of the Common Era, Providence, R.I., 1940, pp. 79ff.

later, but it is of importance to our current line of thought to see that the unity of Israel was considered by the Rabbis to be a spiritual unity, still based on the covenant, of which the Torah was the outward expression.

The cause for the rise of parties and sects within Israel arose out of the high estimation which the whole of Judaism placed upon the Torah. The Pharisees and the Sadducees were radically separated by the question of the extent of the Revelation as well as dogmatic problems.¹ Even schools of interpretation arose within the close ranks of Pharisaic Rabbinism, represented by the names of Hillel and Shammai. Thus, the Law, which was a universal symbol of the uniqueness of Israel became the source of her disruptions. For this reason, in her frustration, Israel was forced to look again to the ideal eschatological future when the Messiah would come to unite all Israel in the perfect observance of the Law.² "God said to Israel, 'On this day I have given you the Law, and individuals toil at it, but in the world to come, I will teach it to all Israel, and they will not forget it.'"³

¹Cf. Macgregor and Purdy, op. cit., pp. 94f.

²S. Hanson notes that the concept of real unity was thus forced to become eschatological, although there were other factors involved. Op. cit., pp. 22f.

³Quoted in R.A., op. cit., p. 168 from Tanh. B., Yitro 38b. Cf. Ecc. R. 2,1.

It was the prominence of the Law in the religious life of Israel which gave rise to the Synagogue. This feature of the religious structure of Judaism is undoubtedly to be explained by the disintegration of the political unity of the nation and the ingrained focal point of the Temple worship in Jerusalem (cf. J.A. Beet, The Church, the Churches, and the Sacraments, London, 1907, p. 9 and G. Johnston, op. cit., pp. 19f.). The Synagogue was more than a place of worship. Not only was it the place where the sacred books of the Torah were kept for the instruction of the people, but they formed schools for the education of Hebrew young men in the history and destiny of the nation. The eschatological importance of the Synagogue was very real. The conviction was common that as soon as all Israel came to know the Law and observe it, the Messiah would appear to change the fortunes of the despised race.

Incorporation Into Israel

1. Introduction. - Our preceding discussion has attempted to present the presupposition of the dogma of Israel's ideal and real unity. Admittedly, the Old Testament had laid the foundation of the conception of the unity of the People of God,¹ but the seclusion of the nation prior to the Exile had provided little reason to challenge the transcendent unity of Israel. Subsequent to the Captivity and the resulting dispersion, the unity of the disinherited people was no longer a self-evident fact. There was an imminent danger that the Jews of the Diaspora, by intermingling with the heathen, should lose their Hebrew identity with its priceless heritage altogether.² This danger was present even in Palestine, as large sections of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah indicate, particularly in the prohibition of the intermarriage of Israelites with the local inhabitants (cf. chaps. 9f. of Ezra and Neh. 13). No less serious, is the problem of intermarriage in the Book of Jubilees. The writer paints the picture of utter horror, declaring that it is equivalent to fornication and merits the same penalty.³

Thus far, we have also noticed evidence to suggest that the solidarity of Israel was based only partially on hereditary and civic foundations. The spiritual factors must be given an equivalent status, however, as basic elements in the liturgy of Judaism will confirm. The rites of initiation into the Community, and practices designed to bolster the spiritual unity of the nation and define the gap between Israel and Gentiles, are significant. They also reflect the Early Jewish conception of the covenantal bond which in the final analysis constituted Israel.

¹ Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., pp. 77ff. and Ch. I, supra.

² Bousset lists five ways in which the integration of Jews of Palestine and those of the Diaspora was maintained, op. cit., p. 71.

³ Cf. J. Bright, op. cit., p. 160 and A. Lods, "Les Antécédents de la notion d'Eglise en Israël," op. cit., p. 21; R.H. Charles, A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. II, 58; Bousset, op. cit., p. 93.

2. Circumcision and Incorporation. - Judaism postulated three basic requirements for the entrance of Gentiles into the Community: 1) $\aleph \dot{\lambda} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota}$ "circumcision," 2) $\aleph \dot{\lambda} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota}$ "baptism," and 3) $\aleph \dot{\lambda} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota}$ "sacrifice."¹ The most important of the three was circumcision. For the "homeborn" as for the proselyte, its performance was considered to secure undeniable entrance into the covenant.² This point is vividly illustrated by a curious example of Rabbinic reasoning:

Because Israelites who are circumcised do not go down to Gehinnon, R. Berachiah said, 'That the Minim and the Wicked of Israel may not say, "We are circumcised, we shall not go down to Gehinnon," what does the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He sends an angel and effaces their circumcision, and they go down to Gehinnon...'³

According to the Midrash, the foreskin of Abraham prior to his circumcision alone was a blemish, without which he should be perfect.⁴ The inference is unavoidable that circumcision was considered to be practically a ticket of admission to the World to Come and that its benefits were irrevocable.⁵

There is some additional evidence in the New Testament. For Paul, circumcision of Gentiles meant that they had been made Jews. In his radical opposition to the Judaizers, this rite was never considered to be a religious technicality which one might accept or reject to soothe the whims of zealous legalists. It

¹E. Schürer, The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, trans. S. Taylor and P. Christi, Div. II, Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1885, p. 319.

²Cf. Sifre Num. par. 108; In the thanksgiving uttered in the grace said during the Passover, mention is made of the covenant which God has sealed "in our flesh." Cf. A.A. Green, op. cit., p. 61. F. Gavin notes that as early as the first century, R. Joshua and R. Eliezar b. Hyrkanos were debating whether circumcision or baptism was the essential rite of initiation into Judaism. Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments, London, 1928, p. 31. Cf. Yeb. 46a; Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 255 n.1.

³Ex. R. 19.4. Cf. R.T. Herford, op. cit., p. 191. Similar propositions were made with regard to Adam and Esau. H.L. Ginsberg, Vol. V, 1925, op. cit., pp. 99f. n.78 and refs.

⁴Gen. R. 46.5. See Yoma 86a on the gravity of non-circumcision.

⁵The houses of Hillel and Shammai agreed that in case of a male born circumcised, he was yet to be cut, that the blood of the covenant might flow. Gen. R. 16.12. He who disguises his circumcision has broken the covenant. Gen. R. 16.13. Cf. A. Büchler, op. cit., p. 98.

meant no less than reversion to Judaism and the abandonment of Christ as the medium of salvation (Gal. 3:2; Acts 15:1f.,5). Circumcision, furthermore, served as a convenient term to distinguish Jews from Gentiles (cf. Gal. 2:7-9).

3. Baptism as a Rite of Initiation. - The second requirement of Gentile proselyte was the מִקְוֶה "proselyte bath." Krauss claims that the origin of the practice was consequent to a recognized need of the Gentile to be cleansed from defilement (especially idolatry) and a conviction that the מִקְוֶה had power to restore the initiate to the purity of a new-born man.¹ It is likely that in the latter part of the Talmudic period, baptism was merely an initiatory ceremony with no special theological significance.² This conclusion is supported by an equation drawn by the Rabbis:

"And he shall be as one that is born in the land." (Ex. 12:48). Even as the homeborn enters into the covenant in three ways, by circumcision, immersion and sacrifice, so too, the proselyte enters into the covenant in three ways, by circumcision, immersion and sacrifice.³

¹In J.E., op. cit., Vol. II, 500. Cf. O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, London, 1950, pp. 10f. A suggestion regarding the origin of this conception may be found in considering that according to Ab. Zar. 22b, a poison or dirt was injected into Eve and continued in her descendants. This "dirt" was removed from Israel through the acceptance of the Law. Cf. R.A., op. cit., p. 306. Oesterley and Box find the origin of baptism in the ritual purifications prescribed in the Law. Op. cit., pp. 257ff., but not partaking of the character of the sacrament. So also, Bousset, op. cit., p. 199. Contrast F. Gavin, op. cit., pp. 4f.

²W. Braude, op. cit., p. 74 n.1. The Sib. Or. IV.164 insist on Gentiles being baptised as an outward token of their conversion. E. Schlürer, op. cit., p. 323. Cf. H.G. Marsh, The Origin and Significance of New Testament Baptism, Manchester, 1941, pp. 8f. C.A.A. Scott is right in claiming that baptism does not confer initiation by itself, but it was more than a bath of ceremonial cleansing. Christianity According to St. Paul, Cambridge, 1939, pp. 114f.

³Mekilta de-R. Simon b. Yohai, p. 30. Cf. Ker. 9a; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 121; F. Gavin, op. cit., p. 31; G.F. Moore, Vol. I, 331. There is an indication of the meaning of immersion for the Jew in the Mishna which also involves the idea of the corporate unity of Israel. "R. Akiba said: 'Blessed are ye, O Israel. Before whom are ye made clean, and who makes you clean? Your Father in heaven; as it is written, 'And I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean' (Ezek. 36:25). And again it says, 'O Lord, the hope (mikweh, is also the laver used for the remission of contracted uncleanness) of Israel' (Jer. 17:13); - as the mikweh cleanses the unclean so does the Holy One, blessed be He, cleanse Israel'" (Yoma 8.9). Cf. H. Danby, op. cit., p. 172.

There is no question of the ablution of the Israelite through immersion, indicating that there is none involved in the baptism of the proselyte either.¹

The baptism of the proselyte was formalized by the attendance of witnesses, and a period of instruction in which two learned men had to stand at his side and acquaint him with some of the minor and major commandments. "After his immersion he is deemed an Israelite in all respects."² To become acquainted with the whole of the written and oral Torah was too much to expect; therefore, when the novice acceded to the instruction of the few Mitzwot he was in reality accepting the whole of Judaism.³

There is an added significance to be noted in the "proselyte bath." The מִצְוַת הַבְּרִית was in a measure, the means by which the novice could experience the past events of Israel's history; in particular the Exodus, the crossing of the Red Sea, and the preparation for the Revelation at Sinai.⁴ As Israel itself in symbolic manner put away all Gentile ways of life, leaving them on the western shore, or drowning them in the sea with the Egyptians, so the proselyte was enjoined to re-experience the same Event sacramentally.⁵ This symbolism was

¹Cf. Judith 8:18-20 and the claim that Israelites are free from the bane of idolatry. Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 30. E. Schürer interprets proselyte baptism as a ceremonial cleansing equivalent to the Levitical bath of purification. Op. cit., p. 322.

²Yeb. 47a-b. Cf. W. Braude, op. cit., p. 78. For assorted texts on the baptism of proselytes see F. Gavin, op. cit., pp. 33ff.

³Cf. Mekilta de-R. Simon b. Yohai, p. 30, "Even as the native among you is one who accepteth all the words of the Torah, so is the proselyte one who had accepted all the words of the Torah." Cf. Gen. R. 70.5, Num R. 8.9, Hag. 14a, and Oesterley and Box, pp. 124, 139. This confidence was not always justified as A. Büchler shows, op. cit., p. 94 and refs.

⁴Cf. H.L. Ginsberg who notes that the preparation for the reception of the Torah was circumcision, baptism (two days before the Revelation), and sacrifice. "On the day preceding the revelation, Moses recorded in a book the covenant between Israel and their God, and on the morning of the day of the revelation, sacrifices were offered as a strengthening of the covenant." Legends, op. cit., Vol. III, 88.

⁵H. Sahlin, "The New Exodus of Salvation According to S. Paul," The Root of the Vine, op. cit., pp. 88ff. Cf. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939, pp. 87f.

integrated with a new ethical motive as W.L. Knox points out. "A past event of history (or mythology), embodied in the ritual action, became an effective symbol for producing a change in the character of the believer."¹ Nor did the Rabbis hesitate to point out that the proselytes were included in the covenant made at Sinai just as were the later generations of Israelites.²

The variety of baptism practised by John included another significance. His baptism was not confined to converts to Judaism but freely included all who wished through repentance to signify their anticipation of the coming Kingdom.³ It was a symbol of moral cleansing, "The baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins" (Mk. 1:4), rather than ceremonial or levitical cleansing.⁴ It does compare favorably with proselyte baptism in that both were a means of incorporation into communities, Israel or the group awaiting the Messiah's advent (cf. Acts 19:1-5).

4. Incorporation and Sacrifice. - The third requirement made of the alien upon admission to Judaism was the presentation of an offering of two doves for a sacrifice.⁵ This practice bound all proselytes as long as the existence of the

¹ Ibid., p. 98.

² Note the comment on Deut. 29:14 in Shebuoth 39a. Cf. W. Braude, op. cit., p. 30. In a more rationalistic outlook, R. Ashi admitted that the proselytes were actually absent but their stars stood in for them. Shab. 145b-146a. A similar opinion is to be inferred from the Tanhuma where the proselytes are commended for accepting the Kingdom of Heaven without the benefit of the miracles which Israel beheld at Sinai. Cf. W. Braude, op. cit., p. 23.

³ C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., p. 39 n.1.; Cf. O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, op. cit., p. 9; H. Sahlin, op. cit., p. 88; W. Manson, "Baptism in the Church," S.J.T., Vol. II, 1949, p. 392; R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 2nd ed., London, 1951, p. 37.

⁴ E. Schlürer, op. cit., p. 324.

⁵ M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 292. The small part which the sacrifices played in the ideas of Rabbinism exemplified in the Talmud according to A.H. McNeile, New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's, Cambridge, 1923, pp. 233f., was due to the Destruction and the distance from Babylon to Jerusalem.

Temple made it feasible. After the Destruction in 70 A.D. a small monetary substitute was accepted by the treasury but was later abolished because of the danger of the fund's mismanagement.

The performance of the sacrificial ritual on the part of the proselyte evinced his acceptance of the Israelite ceremonial and liturgical practice. Moreover, through this rite, the convert offered himself symbolically to God. Thus, it was told that a woman once brought a handful of meal as an offering. The priest despising it, said, "What sort of offering is that? What is there in it for eating or for sacrifice?" "But in a dream it was said to the priest, 'Despise her not: but reckon it as if she has offered herself as a sacrifice.' If in regard to anyone who does not sacrifice himself, the word nephesh is used, how much more fitly of one who does."¹

Through sacrifice, the proselyte gave allegiance to the Presence of the One God and His chosen place of worship, the Temple. He had subsequently the right of participating in all the sacrificial rites and was included in the atonement of the Red Heifer with the rest of Israel.² Regarding the observance of the Passover, Braude significantly points out:

They were included in the first Passover which had been observed in Egypt. Thus we are told that together with the born Jews they were instructed to take a bunch of hyssop, strike the lintel with blood... and not go out until the morning. And then when the wrath of God had come upon all Egyptians, high and low, it had not touched the homes of the proselytes who presumably were of Egyptian origin. No wonder that when Pharaoh pleaded with Moses and Aaron that the children of Israel leave his sorely afflicted land, he begged that the proselytes go along too.³

Throughout the course of the pronouncements regarding the proselyte's status and its rationale, there is a recognition that the convert is incorporated into the

¹Lev. R. 3.5 which is based on a play on the word nephesh in Lev. 2:1 where it signifies "anyone." Cf. R.A., op. cit., 272.

²W. Braude, op. cit., pp. 84f.

³Ibid., p. 88 and references.

united community of the covenant, which had no regard for temporal or racial distinctions.

5. The Status of the Proselyte. - The Rabbis for the most part show a benevolent attitude toward the Gentile proselyte. There are midrashim which compare the convert to a planted vine in contrast to the nations which were cast out. The proselytes become roots just like Israel.¹ They become upon their incorporation into Israel as a new-born babe.² He that persuades a Gentile to become a proselyte is equivalent to having created him.³ It is not uncommon to encounter references to proselytes as the children of Abraham. A typical Rabbinic example of exegesis made Biblical support comparatively easy to find. Thus, in a comment on Genesis 21:7, "Who would have said unto Abraham that Sarah would have given suck to children?" one reads:

The Gentiles brought their children to Sarah that she might nurse them... R. Levi said: Those who come in truth became proselytes, they became children with Israel; the others became great people in the world.⁴

When the proselyte brought his offering to the firstfruits, he was allowed to say along with the Israelite, "I am come unto the land which the Lord swore unto our fathers to give us," on the grounds that God had told Abraham, "The father of a multitude of nations have I made thee" (Gen. 17:5). "He thus became the father of all the people that had taken shelter under the wings of the Shekinah. And it was after all unto Abraham that the promise had first been made

¹Lev. R. 1.2 with the explanation of Ps. 80:8. Note J. Israelstam's comment in Vol. IV of the Midrash Rabba, Socino ed., London, 1939, p. 4 n.1. Cf. Num. R. 8.2. See C.G. Montefiore in R.A., p. 566.

²Just as Israel became at the reception of the Torah. Cf. W. Braude, op. cit., p. 88.

³Gen. R. 39.14.

⁴Pes. R. 180a from R.A., p. 574. Cf. Num. R. 8.3; and, F. Weber, Jüdische Theologie, op. cit., p. 77.

that his 'children' would inherit the land."¹ This evidence contradicts Lietzmann's opinion that the proselyte was never given a status comparable to the natural Israelite.² J. Klausner is nearer the truth in his contention that, "Judaism in the days of the Second Temple, and after, made Gentile proselytes 'sons of the covenant' in such a manner that they were absorbed into the Jewish national community."³

It is of the utmost importance for the purpose of this study to note that the very idea underlying the practice of initiation is the presupposition of the unity of Israel. It is the benevolent extension of privileges which accrue to the proselyte with which the Rabbis were concerned.⁴ These were not offered apart from the Gentile's becoming a true Israelite.⁵ The universalism which this possibility suggests, in no way erases the line of demarcation between Israel and the Nations.⁶

¹Midrash Tannaim, ed. Hoffmann, Berlin, 1908,9, p. 172 quoted in W. Braude, op. cit., p. 84. Cf. Strack - Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. III, 195f. "The Rabbis delighted to think of Abraham, the father of the race and the recipient of the divine promises, as the model proselyte and the supreme proselytizer, and his example naturally carried weight." C. Guignebert, op. cit., p. 157.

²Op. cit., p. 83.

³From Jesus to Paul, op. cit., pp. 534f.

⁴Cf. R.A., op. cit., p. 568. W. Braude comments appropriately, "We thus see that the acceptance of the proselytes in the religious community was so complete that even in ritual matters where the exact meaning of words was important, their inclusion in the 'Israel' was accepted without demure." Op. cit., p. 92. Cf. F. Gavin, op. cit., p. 56 n.1; J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, op. cit., p. 45.

⁵He must be included in the covenant. The school of Hillel says, "He that separates himself from his uncircumcision is as one that separates himself from the grave." M. Eduyoth 5.2.

⁶C. Guignebert comments wryly, "It can be said with perfect truth that in Palestine, universalism was nothing more than an extension of particularism, implying the absorption of the Gentile world by the Chosen People." Op. cit., p. 157. Cf. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 26. An interesting figure is employed in Cant. R. 6.11 to illustrate this attitude. "You have a sackful of nuts, you put many grains of poppy seed, many grains of mustard and yet there is room found for them all. In the same way numerous proselytes may come and find shelter in Israel." On the success of the Jewish mission, see, H. Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 82f.

It does make crossing the line a possibility.¹ This attitude makes the Rabbinic figure of the proselyte under the "wings of the Shekinah"² particularly appropriate. The Presence was the particular divine gift to Israel, signifying God's personal interest in Israel's welfare. The proselyte through his new status partook of this incomparably blessed relationship to the One God.

Besides this, a further implication of this figure was the characteristic of Kedushah (holiness).³ According to Numbers Rabba 8.2, the proselyte is described in terms of *קדושן ייגל*. Even the children of proselytes are said to be born "in Kedushah."⁴ Moreover, the pedigreed Israelite is not allowed to deride the descendant of a proselyte with the taunt, "Remember the deeds of thy fathers,"⁵ for because of his new status, they no longer are his fathers. He is to be considered as a new-born child⁶ of Abraham, whose deeds previous to con-

¹M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 293.

²Mek. II, 186, Lev. R. 1.2. Shekinah literally means "dwelling." It denotes the manifestation of God on the stage of the world, although He abides in the far-away heaven - as sunshine is related to the sun. A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 47. Cf. Gen. R. 19.7 and Mek. II, 27. It is this lofty motive which prompts R. Simon b. Lakish to permit Jews to buy slaves in a heathen market, i.e. that they might be brought under the wings of the Shekinah. Abod. Zar. 13b. These slaves were in turn circumcised, baptized, and enjoined to serve under certain Jewish restrictions of the Law.

³M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 227. Cf. Organic Thinking, op. cit., p. 23. Holiness is primarily the imitation of the divine example, cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., pp. 199f.

⁴M. Yeb. 11.2; Yeb. 87a-b, and 47a. Cf. O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, op. cit., p. 25; Strack-Billerbeck, I, pp. 110ff.

⁵M. Baba Met. 4.10. Cf. Num. R. 8.2; W. Braude, op. cit., p. 14.

⁶Yeb. 62a, 48b, Ger. 2.6. F. Gavin, op. cit., p. 51. Just how radically the proselyte was cut off from previous relationships, was a matter of serious Rabbinic discussion. Generally they insisted on a clean break to the extent that the Gentile mate was divorced and a new Jewish marriage was contracted. E. von Dobschütz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church, trans. G. Bremner, London, 1904, p. 31. Other passages insist on so complete a severance that even marriage to one's sister was tolerated without the charge of incest. Yeb. 62a and 22a. See M. Kid. 4.1 for the Israelite stocks into which the proselyte could marry.

version carry no more responsibility than the deeds of a child prior to birth.¹

The realism used to describe the status of the proselyte as a "Son of the Covenant," casts into relief the exclusion of the Metuentes (God-fearer) from Israel. This is not to say that a certain amount of goodwill was not extended to God-fearers, but they were considered to be on the outside, the fringe of Judaism (cf. Acts 10:2).² Undoubtedly, the community of feeling with Gentiles who had adopted the broad ethical and religious ideals of Judaism, was strong. It was produced by the contrast of friendship versus the animosity which characterized normal Jewish and Gentile relations.³ But they were not included in the concept of "Israel," the statement, "He who renounces idol worship may be called a Jew,"⁴ notwithstanding. One who was ^{not} circumcised or immersed is not a proselyte,⁵ and consequently not eligible for consideration as an initiate into the Community. To be accepted into the covenant implies subjection to the yoke of the commandments.⁶ The God-fearer did not accept the yoke.

A different type of proselyte is encountered in the initiate to the community of the New Covenant. They are the fourth and last group in a series of categories including priests, Levites, Israelites and proselytes.⁷ There is reason

¹Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. II, 421f.

²W. Braude, op. cit., p. 138. Cf. A. Lods, "Les Antécédents..." op. cit., p. 45; K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of S. Paul, London, 1930, pp. 37ff.; J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, op. cit., p. 45. A more tolerant attitude is reflected in Mek. III, 141, "And surname himself by the name of Israel, these are the God-fearing ones."

³On this point see S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 9; Cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., pp. 56ff.; and Bousset, op. cit., pp. 92-96.

⁴Meg. 13a. The point is probably more homiletical than a designation of proselyte status. Note e.g. M. Neg. 3.1 and H. Danby, op. cit., p. 356, n.9. The precise purpose of the revelation of the unclean animals to Peter in Joppa was to break down his prejudice against coming into contact with Cornelius, a God-fearer. Note Acts 10:28 and 11:2 for opinions regarding the God-fearer.

⁵Ber. 47b.

⁶Cf. A. Büchler, op. cit., p. 20.

to agree with Rowley that the converts in question were Jewish rather than Gentile, due to the party's strict shunning of Gentile relationships.¹ They were persons who had not yet been admitted to full membership.² Their goal, however, was clear, namely, to become a part of the true Israel.³ The Manual of Discipline prescribes a long period of initiation for the neophyte which was spoken of as incorporation into the covenant.⁴ Elementary communism and a dedicated study of the Torah was the common lot of the Community under the rule of the Inspector.⁵ The eschatological character of the Covenanters is seen in their imminent expectation of the "coming prophet and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel."⁶

Although there are distinctions to be noted in the three major groups, 1) racial Jews, 2) Gentile proselytes, 3) and the neophyte in the Community of the New Covenant, there is one main point upon which they all agree. To be a true Israelite, one must be incorporated into the historic covenant of Israel. Thus the fundamental conception of the bond of the unity of Judaism, is the covenant. This unity transcends even the closest of religious and kinship ties. The implications of the transcendence of the unity of Israel supplied by the covenant must be

¹"The Covenanters of Damascus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," B.J.R.L., Vol. 35, 1952, 3, Manchester, 1953, p. 127.

²The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, trans. and notes by W.H. Brownlee, New Haven, Conn., 1951, p. 10 (col. 3 lines 20ff.) notes only three divisions. See ibid., p. 11 n.21.

³See the D.S.M.D., col. 5 line 22 and W.H. Brownlee, op. cit., p. 22 n.52. Cf. R.H. Charles, A.P.O.T., Vol. II, op. cit., "Since they claimed to represent the true Israel, especially on the priestly side, to them belonged the covenants and the priestly functions, and the rights of teaching and judging Israel...To them also belonged the Temple at Jerusalem as their Sanctuary; to them belonged Jerusalem, the 'holy city.'" p. 785.

⁴Cf. cols. 5 lines 8, 20; 2 lines 20ff.

⁵Col. 6.2. Cf. further Cols. 5.3 through 7.7; A. Dupont-Somer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, trans. M. Rowley, Oxford, 1952, p. 50. The neophyte was also baptized and given instruction. Cols. 3.6-9 and 5.13f. Cf. G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op. cit., pp. 89f.

⁶Col. 9.11. Cf. W.H. Brownlee, op. cit., p. 50.

considered next.

The Organic Continuity of Israel

The post-Biblical conceptions of the continuity of Israel show some striking similarities to those of the Old Testament. The idea of a single life which pervaded Israel from its national inception down through all time, was not lost. The realism of the primitive Hebrew thought-world, in the days of the Second Temple, became incorporated into the liturgy of Judaism. Thus, in the most ancient Kaddish of Jewish liturgy, this petition occurs: "May He establish His kingdom in your life-time and in your days, and in the life-time of all the house of Israel speedily and in a near time."¹ In a characteristic eulogy of Israel, this statement is ascribed to God, "And I have chosen the seed of Jacob from among all that I have seen and have written him down as my first-born son, and I have sanctified him unto myself for ever and ever, and I will teach them the Sabbath..."² As the sanctification of the divine Name is eternal, it requires the unending continuity of Israel to sanctify it.

The conception of the organic continuity of the nation was founded upon two factors. 1) An unbroken line of life reached back from every Israelite to Abraham as the writer of 2 Baruch illustrates, "And truly I know that behold all

¹Cf. W.O.E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, op. cit., p. 73. Cf. Pss. of Sol. 13.9. A curious type of realism occurs in 4 Ez. 6.8, "From Abraham to Abraham. For from him sprang Jacob and Esau." This phrase is used to denote a short time in lieu of Ezra's query regarding the proximity of the end of the age. G.H. Box suggests that it means the time involved from Abraham to his immediate descendants. A.P.O.T., op. cit., ad loc, n.7. R. Hiyya expounded Eccles. 9:5, "For the living know that they shall die," thus: "These are the righteous who in their death are called living, as it says, 'And Beniah the son of Jehoida, the son of a living (so the kethib) man from Kabzeel, who had done mighty deeds... The son of a living man means that even in his death he was called living." Ber. 18a-b.

²Jub. 2.20. Incidentally, this is a good illustration of oscillation in post-Biblical literature (109-105 B.C.).

we the twelve tribes are bound by one bond, inasmuch as we are born from one father" (78.4).¹ The bond of heredity is the single life which all the descendants of Abraham share in common. 2) Along with heredity was the spiritual bond of covenant into which every Israelite was incorporated through circumcision. The covenant provided as Bousset has said, a "spiritual unity" of all Israel and can only adequately be described as a community whose organization crosses political and social boundaries.² It did more. It gave each individual a realistic link with the past as well as the future on a spiritual level.

It will be illuminating to present the evidence of the Jewish conception of "continuous contemporaneity" from liturgical formulae and festival ritual. Josephus assumes that the command to recite the Shema twice daily originated with Moses. Consequently, he depicts Moses as enjoining: "Let every one commemorate before God the benefits which he bestowed on them at their deliverance out of the land of Egypt..."³ The idea of all generations partaking in the Exodus is more explicit in a saying of R. Gamaliel:

In every generation a man must so regard himself as if he came forth himself out of Egypt, for it is written, 'And thou shalt tell thy son in that day saying, It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I

¹The Book of Jubilees traces the race back to Adam, thus enhancing the antiquity and prestige of Israel. Cf. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 26.

²Op. cit., p. 71.

³Jewish Antiquities, Bk. iv, 212 (Loeb Cl. Lib., op. cit., Vol. IV, 576). Ber. 14b is more explicit in declaring that it was for those who recited the Shema that the redemption, Nassim, and Geburot, at the sea were wrought. Cf. M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 360. R. b. Zoma expounded the reason for the frequent repetition of the Shema thus: "It is written, 'That thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life' (Deut. 16:3). 'The days of thy life' (would mean) the days only; but 'all the days of thy life' (means) the nights also. The Sages say: 'The days of thy life' (means) this world only, but 'all the days of thy life' is to include the days of the Messiah." M. Ber. 1.5.

came forth out of Egypt (Ex. 13.8).¹ Therefore are we bound to give thanks, to praise, to glorify, to honor, to exalt, to extol and to bless him who wrought all these wonders for our fathers and for us. He brought us out from bondage to freedom, from sorrow to gladness, and from mourning to a Festive-day, and from darkness to a great light, and from servitude to redemption; so let us say before him the Hallelujah.²

R. Akiba in turn adds to the Hallel in a prayer of thanksgiving, "...Let us praise thee for our redemption and for the ransoming of our soul. Blessed are Thou, O Lord, for Thou has redeemed Israel."³

In the rules prescribed for the Passover observance contained in the haggada shel pesah the response to be given to the son's question concerning the meaning of the Passover ritual is as follows: "We were slaves to the Pharaoh in Egypt, and the Lord our God brought us forth from thence with a strong hand and outstretched arm."⁴ The implications of the inclusion of the later generations in the Exodus is poignantly recited in the condemnation of the wicked son who has asked, "What mean you by this service?" (Ex. 12:26). "When he thus says 'you' he purposely excludes himself and so rejects one of the principles of Judaism. Therefore mayest thou retort upon him by quoting (Ex. 13:8): 'This is done because of that which the Lord did for me when I came forth from Egypt.'⁵

The same conception of contemporaneity which was accorded the redemption from Egypt was also applied to the election of Israel. Thus the Abadah in its ancient

¹This whole sentence is omitted by the older sources. H. Danby, op. cit., p. 151, n.1.

²M. Pes. 10.5 Cf. Haggada shel pesah in the Revised Haggada op. cit., p. 51; T.H. Gaster, op. cit., p. 63. M. Kadushin terms this a Rabbinic dogma. The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 360.

³M. Pes. 10.6. Cf. the "Litany of Wonders," "If He had cleft the Sea for us, nor let us pass dryshod, dayyemu! If He had let us pass dryshod, nor sunk our foes therein, dayyenu! etc. T.H. Gaster, op. cit., pp. 62f.

⁴A.A. Green, op. cit., p. 27. Cf. the benediction Geullah (ancient title, Emeth we-Yatzib), "From Egypt didst thou redeem us, O Lord our God, and from the house of bondage didst thou deliver us." Cf. 4 Ezra 8.22, 2 Bar. 75.7f.

⁵A.A. Green, op. cit., p. 31. Cf. T.H. Gaster, op. cit., p. 59.

and more or less original form includes this declaration: "...And us hast thou chosen from every people and tongue, and hast brought us near unto Thy great Name..."¹ Actually, the election, the Exodus, and the reception of the Torah were interwoven so that the denial of the yoke of the Torah was declared to be the denial of all the others. Thus, he who denies the mizwot is deprecated as a denier of the Exodus from Egypt.² The basis of such a denunciation was the contemporaneity of Israel's acknowledgment of the Torah. An exemplary statement occurs in the Tanhuma. "'On this day Israel came to Mount Sinai' (Ex. 19:1). Why on this day? Because, when thou learnest Torah, let not its commands seem old to thee, but regard them as though the Torah were given this day. Hence it says, 'On this day,' and not 'On that day.'"³ For this reason, the Jewish teachers attempted to emphasize the literal sense in which Israel would die if she failed to observe the Torah⁴ which as the denial of the Exodus meant also the dissolution of Israel. The preceding discussion and quotations evince the conception of a vertical dimension in the unity of Israel. Through the enactment of circumcision and the partaking of the Passover

¹Cf. W.O.E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, op. cit., p. 49.

²Sifra on Lev. 11:45, ed. Weiss, p. 57b, in M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 358. For other examples of practices which deny the Exodus, see Sifra on Lev. 19:36, ed. Weiss, p. 91b, and Sifra on Lev. 25:38, Weiss p. 109c, and Sifre Zutta on Num. 15:21, ed. Horovitz, p. 290. Cf. M. Kadushin, ibid., p. 359. W.D. Davies remarks appropriately, "The person who fails to read the national experience into his own experience thereby excludes himself from the community. The external facts of history have to become living present realities: the realization of one's own personal participation, as it were, in these external acts of history ipso facto makes one a member of the nation. The individual must himself make the appropriation, he can choose to regard himself as a slave brought out of Egypt or he can refuse to do so, but his very appropriation or refusal involves him in community or isolation." Op. cit., p. 104.

³Yitro par. 7. Cf. Sifre Deut. on 6:6, par. 33, Moore, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 242f. "When Moses summoned the people before God, he said: 'Not with you alone do I make this covenant' (Deut. 29:14). All souls were present then, although their bodies were not yet created." Tan. 8.25b, in R.A., op. cit., p. 108. Cf. Heb. 7:9f.

⁴Cant. R. 2.2 par. 6. Cf. R.A., op. cit., pp. 118 and 672, n.37. "We who have

feast, the Israelite of any given generation became realistically united with his ancestors and their actual experience became his own.¹ The strength of the living bond uniting the members of the race with those yet to be born, became influential in the increasing hope for immortality. Davies is probably correct in attributing the unattractiveness of individual immortality to the Jewish sense of the oneness of the nation. As in the attitude toward the past, the aspirations for

received the Law and sinned must perish, together with our heart, which has taken it in; the Law, however, perishes not, but abides in its glory." 4 Ez. 9.36.

¹Cf. M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 261. There were two other feasts, viz., "Firstfruits" and "Booths," which were important enough to require a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, but they also emphasized the importance of redemptive history (cf. Deut. 26:5-10, 16:13; Lev. 23:41ff.). G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op. cit., p. 70.

The vexed question of the New Year Festival cannot be adequately taken up in this discussion although it is of importance. It was primarily a feast of hopeful rejoicing when Israel "reminded" God in anticipation of His promise to re-gather the scattered tribes, establish the Kingdom, and effect a new creation. (See S. Mowinckel, Psalmstudien, Vol. II, Kristiania, 1921, and the devastating attack in N.H. Snaith's, The Jewish New Year Festival, London, 1947. We must go along with G.E. Wright and note that the evidence of any New Year Festival in the Old Testament period is at best tenuous. It was considerably later that it came to have great cultic significance as reflected in the Talmudic tractate, Rosh-ha-shanah. Cf. The Old Testament Against its Environment, op. cit., pp. 95ff.) From S. Hanson we quote regarding the significance of this feast in Early Judaism: "At the New Year Festival and JHWH's enthronization there is a repetition of the first creation. The new year is a new creation, when JHWH creates life in nature, and reforms political and social conditions. The New Year Festival implies a return of the paradisiacal and original status such as JHWH created the world once in the beginning." Op. cit., p. 13. Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 105. As Israel fixed the kingdom of God in the world (S. Schechter, op. cit., 104f.), so it was expected to be the center of the new creation, the universal kingdom of God on earth in the 'Olam ha-bah. Thus the cult came to have cosmic significance. The retarding of the 'Olam ha-bah secured many explanations from the Rabbis (cf. Yoma 9b). This, as many other evils, was used for hortatory purposes, not the least of which was the disunity of Israel. "As long as Israel is united into one league, the kingdom of Heaven is maintained by them; whilst Israel's falling off from God shakes the throne to its very foundation in heaven." Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 98 and refs. The development of a common brotherhood was expected to attend Israel's reconciliation. Men. 27a. Humbly and expectantly Jews waited during the blowing of the ram's horn during the liturgy of the New Year Festival so that God might remember the binding of Isaac, "and impute it to you as though ye bound yourselves in my presence." Rosh ha-shanah 16a.

the future were modified strictly by the sense of a racial and spiritual solidarity.¹ Thus the writer of 4 Ezra says:

And I said, But lo, O Lord, thou art ready to meet (with blessing) those who survive in the end. But what shall our predecessors do, or we ourselves or our posterity? And he said unto me: I shall liken my judgment to a ring; just as there is no retardation of them that are last, even so there is no hastening of those that are first.²

What in the Old Testament had been a primary emphasis on the immortality of the individual through racial continuity, became in the post-Biblical literature an expectation of individual participation in the Kingdom Community in lieu of the final resurrection. But the idea of salvation "was indissolubly linked with the salvation of the people."³ Davies is still more explicit in suggesting that a popular belief held that the dead of Israel would be raised because of a solidarity of all Israelites of all time.⁴ Thus, the conception of the unity of Israel and her continuity culminated in the eschatological Day of the Lord, the revelation of the Messiah,⁵ the resurrection of the righteous,⁶ and the inauguration of the eternal Kingdom.⁷ This explains R. Joshua's comparison of Israel to a tree. "Why is Israel likened to an olive-tree? To tell you that as the olive-tree loses not its leaves either in summer or winter, so Israel shall never be lost either in this world or in the world to come."⁸ R. Meir argued moreover, "If

¹Op. cit., p. 83. Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 367, A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 376. For the Old Testament conception, see, A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, op. cit., p. 244.

²5.41f. G.H. Box comments, "Just as in the case of a circle there is neither beginning nor end, so God's judgment will reach all generations at one and the same time." A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. II, p. 573. Cf. 2 Bar. 51.13.

³G.F. Moore, Vol. II, op. cit., pp. 312f.

⁴Op. cit., p. 84.

⁵The roots lie buried deeply in the Old Testament prophetic literature which foresaw the restoration of the divine reign, the chosen people and the house of David, together. Cf. C. Guignebert, op. cit., p. 130.

⁶Ber. 18b. Cf. supra. p. 95.

⁷See the T. Judah ch. 25, T. Zeb. 10.2, T. Ben. 10.7.

⁸Men. 53b. Cf. Eccclus. 14.18, "As the leaf that groweth on a luxuriant tree, one fadeth, and another sprouteth; So (are) the generations of flesh and blood, One dieth and another flourisheth."

to the oxen which were attached by the hand of man to the work of the tabernacle, God gave continued existence throughout all ages, how much more Israel who cleave to the Eternal..."¹ Thus, the continuity of Israel was founded in the contemporaneity of her election and redemption historically, but reached into the future eschatologically. As the solidarity of Israel eliminated the demarcation between individuals, the covenant, guaranteeing the continuity of Israel, eliminated the demarcation of death between successive generations, to be realized in the fulness of its implications in the final resurrection.

The Implications of National Unity and Continuity in the Solidarity of Israel

1. The Accessibility of the Zachuth of the Fathers to all Israel. - The most frequently encountered implication of the solidarity of Israel because of its continuity is the notion that the merit² of the Fathers is shared by succeeding generations of Israel. The emphasis of the Old Testament on the extension of God's love to Israel because of His love for the forefathers gained full-blown expansion in the Rabbinic doctrine of the Zachuth Aboth.

As only merit of the highest perfection was of lasting benefit,³ the singular holiness of Abraham was credited for Israel's partaking of many good things. This

¹Cant. R. 6.5.

²צדק is "virtue", "righteousness", "good desert," as in M. Aboth 2.2, but means "acquittal" in a legal sense. In a theological sense, it may refer to something that has a protective or atoning value. It came to mean "for the sake of." See G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. III, 164 and S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 171. H. Loewe points out further that Zachuth Aboth may designate the benefits extended through good training and heredity. But the conception was materialized. R.A., op. cit., p. 219. Oesterley and Box emphasize the aspect of "satisfaction" (of God's demands) and the resultant right of the posterity to a "claim" (a reward from God). Op. cit., pp. 248f. Cf. F. Weber, Jüdische Theologie, op. cit., pp. 277ff.

³Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 182.

zachuth was personal and objective; that is, the Rabbis believed the merit of the Fathers to stem from their own personal righteousness.¹ Thus, it was for the sake of Abraham that all the signal interventions ([א'ו]) on Israel's behalf were wrought.² It is put this way in a parable:

The matter is to be compared to a king who was desiring to build; but when he was digging for the purpose of laying the foundations, he found only swamps and mire. At last he hit upon a rock, when he said, 'Here I will build.' So, too, when God was about to create the world, he saw the sinful generation of Enosh...and the wicked generations of the deluge..., and he said, 'How shall I create the world whilst these generations are certain to provoke me?' But when he perceived that Abraham would one day arise, he said, 'Behold, I have found the rock on which to build and base the world.'³

So great was the merit of Abraham, that the redemption of Israel occurred on that account.⁴ The parting of the Red Sea was ascribed by R. Shemaiah to the merit of the faith of Abraham.⁵ More unusual is the pronouncement: "Likewise did God create Adam for the merit of Abraham, as it is said, 'Thou knowest my sitting in the garden of Eden; Mine uprising (i.e. my exile therefrom). Thou knowest for whose merit Thou hast taken counsel to create me, for the merit of his who comes from afar (i.e. Abraham), as it is said, 'From a far country a man of his counsel.'"⁶ As the Rabbis encountered no difficulty in ascribing prescient knowledge to God, it was natural for them to account for an effect through a temporarily subsequent cause. Finally, when in the Messianic Age, Israel is privileged to sing a new song, it will be in consequence to Abraham's trust in God (cf. Gen. 15:6).⁷

¹A. Marmorstein, The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature, London, 1920, p. 65.

²Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 538f.

³Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 59.

⁴Mek. I, 219f.

⁵See A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 47.

⁶Gen.R. 15.4. Cf. A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 135; R.A. op. cit., p. 38. There are opinions declared by the Rabbis to the effect that the world was created because of Abraham. Gen. R. 1.7; 12.2,9.

⁷Ex. R. 23.5.

Of the meritorious actions of the Patriarchs, the most notable in all regards, was the offering of Isaac. As a result of this exemplary obedience, Abraham found himself in a position to bargain with God over the welfare of his progeny: "I subdued my feelings and carried out thy command. So may it be acceptable before Thee, O Lord God, that when the descendants of my son Isaac are afflicted by trouble and there is nobody to speak in their defence, do Thou defend them."¹ The Rabbinic literature makes a great deal of the voluntary character of the offering on Isaac's part. Instead of a child or youth, Isaac is considered to have been a man in the fulness of his strength, whom the aged father could not have bound against his will.² So unique was the self-surrender of Isaac that the binding became elevated to a liturgical position.³ The Midrash goes the length of claiming that the binding of Isaac atones for the sins of Israel.⁴ Thus Isaac was added to the roster, and given a comparable position with Abraham in supplying zachuth for the children of Israel. Jacob as the single patriarch who was exclusively the father of the nation of Israel completed the number of the "Fathers."⁵

The high esteem accorded the zachuth of the Fathers was probably due to the intercessory prayer of Moses (cf. Ex. 32:13). It was explained that when Israel

¹Gen. R. 56.10, Lev. R. 29.9. Cf. A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 123; See Jubilees 18.15f.

²Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 539.

³Cf. H. Loewe's remarks in R.A., op. cit., p. ci.

⁴Cant. R. 1.14 par. 1. Cf. Ex. R. 44.5. See H.J. Schoeps, "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology," trans. by R.H. Pfeiffer, J.B.L., Vol. 65, 1946, pp. 385ff., passim.

⁵"They call no Fathers but the three, and they call not Mothers but four." Ber. 16b. The reference to the "Mothers" (presumably Sarah, Rebbekah, Rachel and Leah) suggests a אִמֵּי אֱבֹתָנוּ which is invoked. Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 172; M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 38.

sinned in the desert (by worshipping the golden calf), Moses entreated God for forgiveness with many prayers and supplications but was unheeded. Even the forty days and the forty nights were of no avail until he said, "Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob thy servants," and his prayer was heard at once.¹ It is little wonder that the writer of the Testament of Levi was constrained to conclude, "...But for the sake of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob your fathers, not one of my posterity should be left on earth."² There was scarcely any limit to which the merit of the Fathers might not extend. Solomon, before he sinned, earned his own zachuth, but subsequently was dependent upon the merit of his ancestors. Even the world was created for the sake of the Patriarchs.³ Some references describe the zachuth as a good inheritance which has fallen to Israel as a natural prerogative. Israel, for example, is compared to a maiden who has been brought up in a palace. When it came time for her to be married, people said to her, you have nothing at all (no inheritance). She replied, I have something from my father and from my grandfather (i.e. zachuth from Jacob and Abraham).⁴ The very continuance of the nation is due to the goodwill earned by the patriarchs. Therefore, the Midrash blandly states, "Israel lives and endures, because it supports itself on the Fathers."⁵

¹Shab. 42a. Cf. Ex. R. 44.1; S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 174, W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 271.

²15.4. Cf. T. Asher, ch. 7, where the assurance of the regathering of the dispersion is founded on the good desert of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The Books of the Maccabees seek divine succor from Nicanor, "...not for their own sakes, but for the sake of the covenants made with their fathers." 2 Macc. 8,15; Cf. 3 Macc. 2.13.

³Bar. 21.24. Less exclusive are Ass. of Mos. 1.11f., 4 Ez. 6.55,59, 7.11, 2 Bar. 14.19, 15.7, 21.24 which credit this event to the merit of Israel. Cf. R.H. Charles, A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. I, p. 415.

⁴Cf. Pesikta 147b in G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. III, 164.

⁵Ex. R. 44.1. The same conception lies behind R. Meir's distinction between the dead of the Gentiles who are dead and those of the Israelites who are not dead, "for through their merit (i.e. of the Fathers) the living exist. An instance for

Another Rabbi, recognizing the evil of his contemporaries, commented on Song of Songs 1:5, "I am black, but comely," thus, "The congregation of Israel speaks: I am black through mine own works, but comely on account of the deeds of my ancestors."¹

Although the emphasis which the Rabbis placed upon individual responsibility was too great to give wide support to the idea that future salvation was assured all Israelites independently of their own righteousness,² apparently it was a common lay opinion that access to the merit of Abraham was sufficient for sharing in the World to Come. These benefits were seen in a primarily hereditary light. What the Jewish teachers were hesitant to state, John the Baptist openly ascribes to his audience, namely, the opinion that repentance was unnecessary for a son of Abraham.³ In the Rabbinic literature, the redemption of Israel is more often posited on the basis of the merits of the fathers in conjunction with other piacula.⁴

Less frequently, appeal was made to the good desert of the tribal ancestors or Israel's great leaders of the past. There was zachuth available from Judah that the tribe might become worthy of the honor of bearing the scepter was a deduction drawn by R. Tarfon.⁵ The Mekilta tells of an opinion regarding the dividing

this is, when Israel did that deed, had Moses not mentioned the merits of the Fathers, they surely would have perished from the earth." From Tanh., Wayyera par. 9 (pp. 90f.) in A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 51.

¹Ex. R. 23.10. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. I, 118.

²Cf. A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 123. R. Akiba stated that "...even the poor in Israel have to be considered as if they are freemen who have been reduced in circumstances, for in fact they are all the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." B. Kama 90b. This aphorism is attributed to R. Meir in B. Kama 86a. Cf. M. Pes. 10.1; John 8:33, *ὅτι ἐλεῦθεροί γενήσεσθε*. Cf. John 8:39.

³Cf. Luke 3:8.

⁴Cf. H. Loewe, R.A., op. cit., pp. 229f.; Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, pp. 116ff. Thus, Moore states, "Salvation is assured every Israelite on the basis of the election of the nation by the free grace of God - not of merit but love of God which began with the fathers." Op. cit., Vol. II, 94f. Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 174.

⁵Mek. I, 236.

of the Red Sea in consequence of the merit of Joseph.¹ R. Nehemiah contended that the redemption from Egypt was the result of the accumulated merit of Moses and Aaron.² With more regard for the Bible, another Jewish teacher saw the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib as a direct consequence of the merit of David.³

R. Eliezer b. Jacob was more impressed with the possibility of a diffused merit coming from contemporaries. "There is no generation which has not got a just man like Abraham, like Jacob, like Moses, and like Samuel,"⁴ was his opinion. Another statement of the Midrash claims that the world exists for the merit of the righteous and there is no generation lacking such men.⁵ The conception of a "contemporary zachuth"⁶ lent itself to hortatory exploitation more readily than the notion of merit acquired from the past. It is probable that the author is appealing to patriotic and altruistic instincts when he declares: "If there is one righteous man among you, you will all be sustained by his merit, and not only you alone, but also the whole world..."⁷

Other Rabbis, seeing an inconsistency in the justice of the corporate application of merit controvert the majority opinion. Such was R. Hanina b. Gamaliel who

¹Mek. I, 220. The Mek. tractate Beshallah, ch. iv, contains several explanations for the division of the sea. On the nature and cause of these various explanations, see M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 73 and refs.

²Ex. R. 15.3f.

³Ber. 10b. Cf. II Kings 19:34.

⁴Gen. R. 56.9. Cf. Num. R. 3.1.

⁵Gen. R. 74.2. Cf. A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 57; H. Loewe, R.A., op. cit., p. 231. As Israel was responsible for the creation of the world (cf. Ex. R. 38.4 and R.A., op. cit., p. 39 and refs.), R. Joshua b. Levi confidently asserted that mankind only continue to exist because of Israel. Taan. 3b.

⁶Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., pp. 190ff.

⁷Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 191 and refs. See also M. Sanh. 8.5 and H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. V, 67.

said, "Merit and guilt are never interchanged, except in the case of Reuben and David."¹ In any case, the Early Jewish conception of a transferable zachuth is quite different from the Roman Catholic doctrine of the virtuous action cancelling culpability.² The Rabbis maintain that the merit of the ancestors or contemporaries is only the ground upon which God acts with favor toward Israel collectively, without any idea of a measureable amount of merit which may be tapped when the occasion arises.³

2. The Expiatory Value of the Suffering of Righteous Martyrs. - Out of the same thought background and possibly under the influence of the theme of the Songs of

¹Sifra Deut. par. 347.

²G.F. Moore draws the following distinction, "Men may seek of God the forgiveness of sins for the sake of the Fathers, but they cannot claim to have their demerit offset by the merit of the Fathers." Op. cit., Vol. I, 544f. Even previous good works are not capable of cancelling out later evil action. Cf. T. Asher, "Such men are hares (those who do good, but more evil); for they are half clean, but in very deed are unclean." 2.9.

³Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 543; F. Jackson and K. Lake, op. cit., Vol. I, 70.

A final and late development of the doctrine of the zachuth reversed the applicability of merit from the children to the parents. (Cf. A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 95 and S. Schechter, op. cit., pp. 195ff.) Thus, the opinion considered the fact that when God came to secure sureties for Israel when she accepted the Torah, He found that the patriarchs and the prophets had sinned. Israel thereupon, offered their children (presumably because of their assumed innocence), and God immediately accepted the bargain and for this reason punishes the children when the adults of Israel neglect the Torah. (Cf. R.A., op. cit., p. 519 and refs.; G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 165; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. III, 90.) More than one midrash even claims that Abraham was delivered from the furnace of Nimrod, through the merit of Jacob, his descendant. (Cf. Lev. R. 36.4f; see H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 175f. for the background.) When the children are killed because of their fathers' transgressions, it is because they are implicated in the guilt of their fathers. In the World to Come, the tables will be reversed, for the attribute of goodness is greater than the attribute of punishment. The fathers will therefore inherit the reward of the future age because of the merit of their righteous progeny (Eccles. R. 4.1, proposing the ground and result of Elijah's defense). Other passages refer to the suspending of the judgment of the fathers until the zachuth of the progeny should accumulate. The delay was in vain, for the sons had none to spare (cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 197). Other opinions designate the death of infants as either punishment or atonement for the sins of the parents (cf. e.g. Shab. 32b; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends,

the Servant, comes the conception of the atoning value of the deaths of Israel's martyrs.¹ Specific support for this view was deduced from 2 Samuel 21:14, "They buried the bones of Saul and Jonathan...and after that God was entreated for the land."² But more basically, the idea of justice was involved. Thus, Baruch is chagrined at the apparent injustice of God who is allowing Zion to go into captivity in spite of those within her walls who "...always feared Thee, and have not left Thy ways."³ As Abraham had argued over the destruction of Sodom, Baruch continues, "And if others did evil (within Jerusalem), it was due to Zion, that on account of the works of those who wrought good works she should be forgiven, and should not be overwhelmed on account of the works of those who wrought unrighteousness."⁴ But one more step was needed to arrive at the conclusions drawn in histories of the Maccabees. The prayer of one of the seven brothers martyred by Antiochus is very significant:

I, like my brothers, give up body and soul for our fathers' laws calling on God to show favor to our nation soon...and to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen on the whole of our nation, end in me and my brothers.⁵

An identical conception is reflected in the prayer recorded in 4 Maccabees:

Be gracious to Thy people, being satisfied with our penalty on their behalf. Make my blood their purification and take my life as the substitute for theirs. Because of them the enemy hath no more power over our people, and the tyrant was punished, and the fatherland purified, inasmuch as they have become a substitute (for the life forfeited by) the sin of the people;

op. cit., Vol. VI, 35; S. Schechter, op. cit., pp. 196f.). The exposition of Zech. 4:10, by R. Raba will illustrate the point: "They are the little ones (children who died young) among the children of the wicked of Israel who despoil the verdict upon their fathers in the Hereafter..." Sot. 48b-49a.

¹Cf. H. Loewe, R.A., op. cit., p. ci.

²Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. III, 164f.

³2 Bar. 14.5f. and 8.

⁴Ibid., 14.7. Says C. Guignebert, "There is no doubt that Judaism was well acquainted with the idea of expiatory suffering." Op. cit., p. 148. Cf. M.-J. Lagrange, Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, Paris, 1909, p. 236.

⁵2 Macc. 7.37f. Cf. also 7.32, "We are suffering this on our own account..." doubtless refers to Israel as a whole.

and through the blood of these pious men and their propitiatory death, the divine Providence rescued Israel that before was afflicted.¹

H.W. Robinson sees the underlying conception in these prayers and comments, as the crucial point of many mingled lines of thought. In brief, the notion of human vicarious substitution is brought into focus.² In consequence of the solidarity of the group, Israel, the replacement of one for another or for the many, is not a surprising conclusion. It is no longer the conception of the merit of the righteous receiving a wider application, which does not involve the fundamental concept of the justice of God. On the contrary, the visiting of the judgment of God upon the heads of the righteous, means that the sinner(s) within the group will go free. The justice of God never can be supposed to require a double penalty. In brief, the conception of a vicarious substitutionary atonement has been elevated from the commonplace in the Jewish sacrificial system (the innocent animal suffering in the place of the guilty sinner) to the idea of expiation through human suffering or death.

Turning to Messianic conceptions and isolated references to the expiatory value of the suffering of the Messiah, the principle involved is identical. Thus, the Testament of Benjamin pretends to preserve a statement made by Jacob to Joseph, "In thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven (), that a blameless one shall

¹6.28f., 17.21f. translated by H.W. Robinson. Cf. comparable parallels in the Rabbis, Lev. R. 20.12 and Mo'ed Katon 28a. On the conception of the expiatory value of death see M. Yoma 8.6ff., M. Sanh. 6.2; A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 114; R.B. Townshend's brief but comprehensive discussion in A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. I, 663f.

²The Cross of the Servant, op. cit., p. 61. Robinson terms this passages an example of the martyrs' acceptance of Israel's corporate personality. Ibid., pp. 59f. Cf. further, G.F. Moore, Vol. III, op. cit., p. 166. A prior principle of Pharisaic belief was that forgiveness could never be secured without the payment of the debt by someone, if not by the offender. Cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., pp. 267ff.

be delivered up for lawless men, and a sinless (one) shall die for ungodly men ()."¹ The context leaves no doubt that the "lawless" men are Joseph's own brothers.² Thus, this passage still maintains that the transference of the penalty will remain within the group of Israel. It is not an instance of a pious man voluntarily accepting the sin of others by becoming one with them in experience on moral lines rather than on the basis of physical association, or racial-covenantal lines.

In the later eschatological speculation, the expectation of a Messiah who would come and through his suffering produce atonement, becomes more prominent.³ One example is found in the Pesikta Rabati:

Great will be the suffering which the Messiah of the tribe of Ephraim has to undergo for seven years at the hand of the nations, who lay iron beams upon him to crush him so that his cries reach heaven; but he willingly submits for the sake of his people, not only those living, but also the dead, for all those who died since Adam; and God places the four beasts of the heavenly throne-chariot at his disposal to bring about the great work of resurrection and regeneration against all the celestial antagonists.⁴

¹3.8. The brackets denote what R.H. Charles considers to be obvious Christian interpolations. Cf. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, London, 1917, p. vi. The parallels with the Testaments and the recently discovered Dead Sea Scrolls may require a modification of earlier ideas concerning the Testaments and what is actually Christian interpolation.

²Compare the reference to the rest of Israel as the domain of Belial, in the D.S.M.D.

³Cf. M.-J. Lagrange, Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, op. cit., pp. 236f. For citations from the Rabbis, see R.A., pp. 584ff. See G.H. Dix, "The Messiah Ben Joseph," J.T.S. Vol. 27, 1926, for the origins of the conception of the suffering Messiah. Besides the line of proof offered by E.G. King in his appendix to the Yalkut of Zechariah, op. cit., there is an indication to be found in Gen. 49 and the Testament of Benjamin. G.H. Dix, op. cit., pp. 130f.

⁴36, in K. Kohler, "Eschatology," J.E., Vol. V, 215. Another citation from R. Jose (2nd cent., at least such is that stated opinion of Raymundus in his Fugio Fidei, although omitted from extant Mss. of the Sifre) is very significant, if genuine. "Deduce, moreover, a conclusion as to the merit of King Messiah and the reward of the righteous from that first Adam: the latter transgressed but one divine command and see! with how many deaths transgression has been punished again and again in him and the following generations. Which power then, is the greater, that of goodness or of retribution. The power of goodness has the predominance. For King Messiah, who has borne in himself sufferings and anguish for transgressions,

Although, there is no conclusive proof, a strong suspicion has been raised to the effect that the speculation regarding the suffering¹ of the Messiah received some of its impetus from Christian doctrine. C.C. Torréy vigorously denies this position.² Certainly the idea was latent in the Old Testament. Moreover, the cases of the Maccabean martyrs may have stimulated the idea of an all inclusive vicarious atonement by so prominent a figure as the Messiah b. Ephraim. It is of more than general interest to note that the suffering of the Ephraimite Messiah produces atonement also for the dead, and that going back as far as Adam. This merit did not, of course, avail the wicked, but there is reason to think that the resurrection was expected to include all of the righteous, extending even beyond the national confines of Israel. Although the evidence is inconclusive, there is a suggestion of a solidarity which binds all the righteous of all time together.³

as it is said (Isa. 53:5), 'He was wounded for our transgressions' - how much more will his sufferings be meritorious for all generations, as it is written (Isa. 53:6), 'The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all.'" (Cf. Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 93, also n.1; M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 244.) Without the reference to the Messiah, this statement does occur in Sifra 27a (cf. R.A., op. cit., p. 205). Although J. Woods (The Old Testament in the Church, London, 1949, p. 13. Cf. K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of S. Paul, op. cit., p. 408) affirms that the 53rd Chapter of Isaiah was not referred to the Messiah until the third century, the Targum on Isaiah identifies the Servant with the Messiah; but contorting everything to conform with the worst excesses of Jewish nationalistic doctrine (W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, London, 1943, p. 170. See ibid for texts in translation. Cf. also M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., pp. 242f. and J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, op. cit., p. 526.)

¹Cf. Zech. 12:10 (cf. Suk. 52a), Isa. 53 (see Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, chs. 68, 89f.; Sanh. 98b refers to the Messiah as the "Leper" (hiwwara, cf. Isa. 53:4); Ps. 22:8-16 (cf. Pes. R. 37). See W.D. Davies op. cit., pp. 280ff. and F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., pp. 346f.; Bousset, op. cit., pp. 230f. For the confusion between the Messiahs of Joseph and Judah, see K. Kohler, J.E., Vol. V, 215.

²"The Messiah Son of Ephraim," J.B.L., Vol. 66, 1947, p. 257.

³Primary reference was made to Israel, but E. Schürer traces the universalizing tendency of the Messianism of this period which included all mankind in its scope. Op. cit., pp. 130f. Cf. 4 Ez. 7.29, 32.

The Jewish conceptions of the corporate sharing in an ancestor's merit or the atoning value of the death of righteous martyrs was born in the matrix of the self-consciousness of the mysterious unity of Israel. The awareness of this solidarity coupled with an unswerving confidence in the justice of God, as well as his mercy, led to these fundamental elements of Jewish thought.

3. The Corporate Implication of Israel in the Sin or Demerit of a Member. -

A corollary to the conception of corporate merit, was the conception of the united group sharing in the guilt, defilement, or penalty, deserved by a member or segment of Israel. Because suffering in the Jewish mind was invariably integrated with chastisement,¹ no alternative to the explanation that the righteous shared the demerit of the wicked, occurred to the Jewish thinkers in lieu of the undeniable fact that the innocent do suffer. Beyond the evidence deduced from Israel's historical experience, the Scriptures themselves spoke directly of the judgment of God upon sons for the iniquity of the fathers. Thus, sin became the direct counterpart of the zachuth of the ancestors, prompting Marmorstein to speak of a treasure of good or bad deeds, the fruits of which differed according to the character of the action.²

The Rabbinic subscription to the unquestionable justice of God was difficult to square with the suffering of the righteous.³ Some adopted the position that although Moses had said, "Visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the

¹"There is no suffering without iniquity," is the categorical Jewish conviction. Cf. Shab. 55a-b; Sanh. 90a. The curious expression "filling up the iniquity of the nation," (cf. e.g. Amorites, Jub. 14.16; Israel, Matt. 23:32) suggests the accumulation of a national hoard of sin which upon reaching a certain proportion would be the signal for the destruction of the nation.

²Op. cit., p. 7.

³M. Kadushin claims that one of the four fundamental concepts of the Rabbis was the justice of God. Cf. Organic Thinking, op. cit., passim.

children," Ezekiel came and annulled it, saying, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die."¹ But this solution in reality solved nothing since the innocent obviously suffered with the sinners, leading to the explanation that one's lot in the world was no indication of one's righteousness or wickedness since the World to Come would settle accounts.² Neither of these solutions became universal for they assumed an independent individualism which ran counter to the ingrained conception of the solidarity of Israel.

The starting-point of the more traditional doctrine of the corporate responsibility of each individual was the maxim, "All Israel are a surety, one for another."³ This precept was developed in its ethical connotation to emphasize the importance of the interaction of human influence. The interpretation of Leviticus 26:37, "And they shall stumble one upon another," was thus given: "One (will stumble) through the sin of the other, which teaches that all are held responsible for one another. There the reference is to such as had the power to restrain (their fellowmen from evil) but did not."⁴ The Rabbinic reticence in admitting that Achan's children suffered death along with their father, was conditioned by the problem of the justice of God, but they were quick to add that the children's presence at the execution was essential because of its deterring

¹Mak. 24a. Cf. Num. R. 19.33.

²Cf. A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 34. Note Ber. 7a and Kid. 39b, "There is no commandment in the Torah where the reward is mentioned in the context which is not dependent for its fulfilment upon the future life..." Cf. A. Cohen, op. cit., pp. 122, 124. From Taanith 11a, four points may be extracted. 1) The retribution of the righteous is applied in this world. 2) The retribution of the wicked is reserved for the world to come. 3) The reward of the righteous is in the World to Come, but 4) that of the wicked is in this world. Cf. S. Levy, Original Virtue and other Short Studies, London, 1907, p. 51.

³Cf. Num. R. 10.5; S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 191.

⁴Sanh. 27b. Cf. Kid. 40a, where the sin that bears fruit is that which spreads, causing others to sin also. R.A., op. cit., 288.

effect on evil actions.¹

The corporate responsibility of the Israelites stemmed from the giving of the Torah:

Ye stand this day, all of you, before the Lord, all the men of Israel (Deut. 29:10). All of you are pledges one for the other: if there be but one righteous man among you, you exist all of you through his merit, and not you alone, but the whole world, as it says, 'And the righteous is the foundation of the world' (Prov. 10:25). If one man sins, the whole generation suffers, as was the case with Achan (Josh. 22:20). How much more will the good done by an individual benefit his environment!²

This citation indicates a departure from the notion of a mere interaction of influence within a group. It is rather a recognition that all Israel will share in the penalty of the sin of one of its members. This is better illustrated in the comments of R. Simeon b. Yohai on Numbers 16:20ff. A number of men sitting in a boat observed one of their companions take an auger and begin to bore a hole beneath his own seat. Upon being required to account for his purpose, he answered, "What business is it of yours?" But they retorted, "It is our business, because the water will come in and swamp the boat with us in it."³ The same point is made in the Midrash on Song of Songs 6:11, employing the figure of nuts. "How is it with the nuts? you take one out of a heap and all begin to roll and get into commotion. Even so it is with Israel, when one of them is beaten, all

¹ Cf. Sanh. 44a; S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 191, G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 471.

² Tanh. B., Nizzabim 25a in R.A., op. cit., p. 221. Cf. A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 71, who maintains that it refers to moral responsibility. But corporate justice is far from excluded by the Rabbis. It is incorporated into the concept of the justice of God as in Mekilta II, 205f., "A nation one in the earth (I Chron. 17:21) - One of them commits a sin and all of them are punished," indicating that the corporate principle is applied in all of its rigorousness to Israel. Cf. M. Kadushin, "Aspects of the Rabbinic Concept of Israel," op. cit., pp. 86f. "The Rabbis go to all lengths to teach that God's justice is infallible in this world, both in the lives of individuals and in the history of nations, and to this end they are even forced to employ a principle with which they have great difficulty, namely, corporate justice." M. Kadushin, Organic Thinking, op. cit., p. 82.

³ See G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 471. Cf. Lev. R. 4.6.

feel the blow."¹ The liability of each member of the community for the actions of all of its members is a two-pronged proposition. On the one hand, it required that no deterrent influence might exist; and on the other, it claimed that the judgment of heaven visited the divine wrath upon the wicked and righteous alike within the confines of the group.²

Various twists were given to the theme of the corporate justice of God. R. Simai might be charged with overstating the case when he reasoned: "Why has God created just and wicked people? In order that they shall atone for each other, rich and poor, so that they might help one another."³ But this statement is not so unique as it might at first appear. There is a meaningful passage in the Talmud which reflects the frustration of the Jewish mind:

Punishment does not come upon the world unless there are wicked persons in existence, and it only makes a beginning with the righteous; as it says, 'If fire break out and catch in thorns so that the stacks of corn have been consumed' (Ex. 22:6). When does fire (i.e. punishment) break out? When there are thorns (i.e. wicked) found about. And it only makes a beginning with the righteous (represented by the corn stacks); as it is said, 'So that the stacks of corn have been consumed.' The text does not state, 'will be consumed' (i.e. after the thorns), but 'have been consumed.' They were burnt first. What is the intention of the verses, 'And none of you shall go out of the door of his house until the morning, for the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians'?

¹ Cant. R. 6.11 par. 1. See also A. Feldman, op. cit., p. 179.

² Both implications involved in the corporate justice of God are used by the Rabbis to create moral responsibility on the part of the Community. Thus, in the Mekilta, reference is made to a desired check on the principle of liability in the case of sins committed in secret, but it was not granted. Mek. II, 23Of. Each individual is by this principle cautioned not even to commit any secret sin, lest he implicate the whole of Israel in his penalty.

³ Pes. R. 191a. Cf. A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 187. Note Pes. R. 201a in R.A., op. cit., pp. 542, 688 n.91. Cf. Ecc. R. 7.30. 4 Ezra 7:102-115 admits this inclusive judgment for the present age, but denies its validity in the Day of Judgment. See G.H. Box's note ad loc., A.P.O.T., Vol. II, 589f. Another passage in the Tanhuma says, "Until the revelation of the Torah, God visited the sins of the generation on all alike, without discriminating between the righteous and the wicked - many a 'Noah' died in the deluge, and many an innocent child perished with the builders of the tower - but after the revelation of the Torah, punishment and reward are meted out to each and every individual according to his merits." H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, Vol. VI, 35 and refs.

(Ex. 12:22f.)? Since permission had been granted to the angel of death to destroy, he does not discriminate between the righteous and the wicked. More than that he begins with the righteous; as it is said, 'I will cut off from thee the righteous and the wicked' (Ezek. 21:3)."¹

Not only is the opinion expressed that the righteous were the first to feel the pangs of corporate judgment, but the innocent might even be the vast majority of the group involved. Thus, R. Hezekiah b. Hiyya claimed that the sinning of even one Israelite endangered the whole of Israel.²

As in the application of the principle of zachuth aboth, corporate justice freely crossed the generation barriers,³ visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children and causing the penalty of the children's iniquities to be required of their parents. According to the Rabbis, the baneful touch of the guilt which Israel incurred through the worship of the Golden Calf fell on all human succession. In brief, "There is no generation in which there is not an ounce from the sin of the Golden Calf."⁴ The idea of the children being implicated in the guilt of

¹B. Kamma 60a. Cf. B. Kama 92a; A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 125, H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, Vol. VI, 392; A. Feldman, op. cit., p. 58.

²Cf. A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 68. Note e.g. the division of the kingdom because of the sins of Solomon in Ecclus. 47:20. Such ideas do not necessarily imply that all of the nation was wicked excepting the one righteous individual. A current opinion held that merit and demerit was diffused on the basis of a balanced scale. "He performed one commandment, and bliss is unto him, for he may by this have inclined the scales (צ'כ'כ'כ) both with regard to himself and with regard to the whole world to the side of zachuth. He committed one sin, woe unto him, for he may by this have inclined the scales both with regard to himself and with regard to the whole world" (cf. Kid. 40b; See further, Kid. 39b, M. Kid. 1.10, S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 190).

³Cf. e.g. Bar. 1.19f., 2.1-10; Gen. R. 41.11.

⁴Jer. T. Taanith 68e in A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 102. Sanh. 102a limits the effects to 24 generations. According to Abodah Zar. 5a claims that following the acceptance of the Torah, Israel should not have been under the power of the Angel of Death, but because of this communal rebellion, Jews are doomed to "die like mortals." In the Mekilta (II, 205) it is the sin which brought the prohibition of the eating of the holy things for the common Israelites. H. Loewe compares this worst of all sins to the place which the transgression of Adam filled in Christian theology. R.A., op. cit., p. 689 n.96. Cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., pp. 264ff.,

their forebears is not infrequently encountered in the New Testament. Jesus' disciples enquire, "Who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind" (John 9:2)? When Pilate seeks to absolve himself from the guilt of condemning an innocent Man, the mob shouts, "His blood (i.e. guilt) be on us, and upon our children" (Matt. 27:25). Jesus endorses corporate justice in the denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees, "All the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias..." would surely be required of their generation (cf. Matt. 23:35f.).

Demerit, reverting to implicate ancestors, is found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Because of the forewarning which Levi has given to his children, he says confidently, "I am clear from your ungodliness and transgression, which ye shall commit in the end of the ages."¹ In the same vein Simeon declares his exculpation from the guilt of his progeny, "Behold, I have told you all things, that I may be acquitted of your sin."² Israel, depicted as a widow, laments, "For the sins of my children am I left desolate."³ These passages may actually define no more than the corporate personality of the tribe or nation, and not refer to an actual reversal of the implication of the children in their parents' guilt.

The discussion thus far shows an affinity to the later Christian doctrine on Original Sin. But there are noteworthy distinctions as we shall see (*infra*). The pernicious implications of sinful members within the Sacred Society, because of the justice of God, resulted in effects which could be properly limited to the precise offender. It is difficult to know whether the Rabbis thought of sin as being actually corporate in the same realistic sense as the Old Testament did. There

M. Kadushin, Organic Thinking, op. cit., pp. 19, 310 n.347; S. Levy, Original Virtue and Other Short Studies, London, 1907, p. 47.

¹T. Levi 10.2.

²T. Simeon 6.1.

³Bar. 4.12.

may be such a realism in this statement:

'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' With regard to all other sins mentioned in the Law, it says, 'I God, will forgive;' but here it says, 'God will not forgive.' For all the other sins, the sinner alone is punished: for the false oath, both he and his family, for it says, 'Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin' (Eccl. 5:6), and by flesh is meant his relatives, as it says, 'Hide not thyself from thy own flesh' (Isa. 58:7).¹

A derived idea from the conception of a corporate contraction of guilt within the group, was the uncoerced assumption of sin by innocent or righteous individuals. The example of Moses was archetypal, a source of Rabbinic marvel. Seeing that there was no continuance for Israel, "He united his life with their life, and he broke the Tables, and he said to God, 'They have sinned, and I have sinned. If thou wilt pardon them, pardon me too; but if thou wilt not pardon them, then pardon not me; blot me out of thy book'" (Ex. 32:32).² By such selfless surrender of his own deserved reward of righteousness,³ Moses set the immortal pattern for successive generations of Israelites in general and the righteous in particular. The challenge to communal responsibility was accepted by Judaism as Israel's liturgical expression amply illustrates.

A classic example of the Jewish awareness of corporate guilt occurs in the sixth benediction of the Shemoneh 'Esreh. Oesterley translates from the Babylonian recension:

Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned;
Pardon us, our Father, for we have transgressed,
For Thou are the God of goodness, Thou dost forgive...⁴

¹ Sheb. 38b-39a. Cf. R.A., op. cit., p. 399. For the Jewish conception of family solidarity, see the Sifra 91c in S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 192.

² Ex. R. 46.a; cf. 35.4, Sot. 14a. The Rabbis explained the word-sequence of Isa. 63:11, "And He remembered the days of old, Moses, His people," as a scriptural designation of Moses' reward, as though he had created Israel. Cf. M. Kadushin, Organic Thinking, op. cit., p. 192.

³ Note the promise that God would make of Moses a great nation (Ex. 32:10).

⁴ The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, op. cit., p. 63. Note also the Prayer of Azariah, vv. 5-9. 14. and a citation in the Dead Sea Manual of

The effective spread of the conception of communal responsibility may have been due in part to the most impressive ritual in ancient Judaism. On the Day of Atonement the high-priest became a stand-in for all of the congregation of Israel. The Mishna describes his role as follows:

And the priest stood at the east, with his face westwards, and pressed his two hands on it (i.e. the goat), and made confession; and thus did he speak, O God (lit. Name), I have done iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned (אָפֵּטְרָה עֲוִיּוֹתַי וְפָשָׁעַי), before Thee, I and my house...And they responded after him, Blessed be the Name of the glory of His Kingdom for ever and ever.¹

It is apparent that the assumption of the corporate guilt of the nation by the High-priest is considerably more explicit than the directions for the observation of the Day of Atonement in Leviticus ch. 16, call for.

The Selichoth (i.e. prayers for forgiveness) were both an early and significant element in Jewish liturgy.² They were based in their original form on such texts as Isaiah 20:20 and Daniel 9:9 and incorporated into the Temple ritual.³ In these as well as in the forms of confession adopted by the Synagogue worship, an indomitable witness is borne to the strong conception of communal responsibility in Israel. The modern Authorized Jewish Prayer Book reflects ancient confessional prayers which date back to the turn of the era,

Discipline: "...And the Levites shall recount the iniquities of the Children of Israel, and all their guilty transgression and their sin under the dominion of Belial. (Then all) who enter into the covenant shall confess after them, saying, 'We have perverted ourselves! (We have transgressed, we have sinned,) we have done wickedly - both we (and our fathers) before us - because we have walked contrary to true (ordinances.) Col. 1.24ff. For the confirmation of the early date of the Shemoneh 'Esreh, see K. Kohler, "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions," H.U.C.A., Vol. I, 1924.

¹Yoma 3.8.

²H. Lietzmann correctly maintains that these prayers (cf. e.g. 3 Macc. 2:1-20) are Jewish in spite of their Greek dress assumed in parts of the Diaspora. Op. cit., p. 101.

³Cf. W.O.E. Cesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, op. cit., p. 76.

invoking the theme of the corporate implication of all Israel in the sin of individual Israelites.

It is not surprising that the stress placed upon the corporate involvement of the nation in the sin of a part,¹ had two opposing effects on the individual awareness of personal guilt. 1) Levison is impressed with the willingness of the Jew to take his stand on the fact of lineal descent from Abraham, and rise or fall with the nation.² Thus, it became decreasingly important that individual sin offerings be made, since the national slate which included those sins was wiped clean by the high-priest on the Day of Atonement.³ 2) On the other hand, it must be recorded to Israel's credit that the reality of corporate implication in sin was genuinely recognized. "When the community is in distress, a man must not say, I will go home and eat and drink, peace be unto thee, O my Soul; but a man must share with the community and its distress, like Moses, and then he is worthy to see its consolation."⁴

Maybe the most striking example of the application of the principle of the corporate involvement of all Israel in the sin of one member is encountered in the denunciation of the practice of mixed marriage. The incorporation of an unclean Gentile into the Holy Community is viewed with horror in the Book of Jubilees:

¹ We have failed to discuss, for lack of space, the Jewish conception of a community sin, in distinction from individual. For the former idea, see, Rosh Ha-shanah 17b, Ab. Zar. 4b-5a, M. Hor. 1.5. Cf. J.D. Eisenstein, "Sin," J.E., op. cit., Vol. XI, 377.

² The Jewish Background of Christianity, Edinburgh, 1932, p. 73; Cf. A. Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 4, but note the modifications made by MacGregor and Purdy, op. cit., p. 77.

³ The problem was recognized by the Rabbis who consequently attempted to emphasize the necessity of individual repentance in conjunction with the Day of Atonement. Note e.g. M. Yoma 8.8f. and A. Büchler's discussion, op. cit., p. 411; MacGregor and Purdy, op. cit., p. 78; D.S.M.D., col. 3.4f. A conflict of opinion is found in statements regarding the exonerating power of the Day of Atonement regardless of the repentance of the sinner. Cf. Sheb. 13a-b.

⁴ Taan. 11a. Cf. F. Jackson and K. Lake, op. cit., I, 57f.

And Israel will not be free from this uncleanness if it has a wife of the daughters of the Gentiles, or has given any of its daughters to a man who is of any of the Gentiles...Then shall the whole nation together be judged for all the uncleanness and profanation of this man (who takes a Gentile wife).¹

This passage serves well to conclude a discussion on the solidarity of Israel. In the first instance, the mixed marriage is viewed as a violation of the holiness of the united Community. In other words, the unity of the group is a unity of kind which is destroyed through any unsanctified element being inserted into it. In the second instance, the solidarity of the group is of such a realistic nature, that the sin of the one was the sin of the many. As we go on to discuss the Jewish views regarding the implications of Adam's transgression, this latter element will be again brought into play.

Jewish Ideas Regarding the Solidarity of Mankind

The Unity of the Human Race Through Creation

From the Jewish doctrines of the unity of Israel we turn now to the stated opinions regarding the unity of the human race. As we noted in our examination of the evidence for solidarity in the Old Testament, the solidarity of mankind falls out of the awareness of the group, becoming more or less the property of theological speculation. Both the historical assurance that all men were the descendants of one man, and the eschatological hope, implemented the Rabbinic and Apocalyptic discussions on the unity of the race.

¹30.14f. Cf. 33.11; T. Levi 9.10; Pirke de-R. Eliezer, p. 304. A perusal of the tractate Yadaim in the Mishna, will indicate how conscious Judaism was of the ceremonially clean and unclean. The meticulous rules have been used to confirm G.F. Moore's opinion that Early Judaism was unaware of a distinction between moral and ceremonial defilement (cf. History of Religion, op. cit., Vol. II, 42f.). A. Büchler, op. cit., ch. iv, 270ff., has quite adequately refuted this position. Cf. A.C. Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism, Edinburgh, 1935, pp. 280f. Apparently the fundamental contradiction between these two views of sin was resolved by the more conscientious Jews through the medium of symbolism, the ceremonial purity seen as a counterpart to the morally holy.

1. The Creation of Man and its Implications. - That Adam was the human father and origin of the race was unquestioned Jewish doctrine. The unimpeachable declaration of the Scriptures assured as much, but the Rabbis found that this teaching could be used profitably in hortatory exposition. It was used primarily to promote an awareness of the universal collective responsibility of each individual. A quotation from G.F. Moore based on Rabbinic sources will illustrate this:

All men notwithstanding their different appearance were stamped by God with one seal, the seal of Adam. Therefore every man is bound to say, 'On account of me the world was created. That is, is to feel himself individually responsible as though the whole human race depended on his conduct.'¹

Thus, man has been accorded a special dignity through his creation. This is the particular burden of R. Akiba, "Beloved is man for he was created in the image of God; but it was by a special love that it was made known to him that he was created in the image of God..."² This type of statement indicates that Judaism upheld the principle of the unity and mutual responsibility of mankind on the basis of its own ethical monotheism.³ The consequent value of the individual motivates a noteworthy statement from the annals of Early Judaism:

Why was only a single specimen of man created first? To teach us that he who destroys a single soul destroys a whole world, and that he who saves a single soul saves a whole world; furthermore, in order that no race or class may claim a nobler ancestry saying, 'Our father was born first;' and finally to give testimony to the greatness of the Lord, who caused the wonderful diversity of mankind to emanate from one type. And why was Adam created last of all beings? To teach him humility; for if he be overbearing, let him remember that the little fly preceded him in the order of creation.⁴

¹ Judaism, op. cit., Vol. I, 445. Cf. Kid. 40b, and 39b.

² M. Aboth 3.18. The Rabbis found the essential principle of the Torah in Gen. 5:1 which treats of the descent of all mankind from Adam and hence provides the basis for the doctrine of the universal brotherhood of mankind. Cf. R. Gordis, "Adam," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, 1939, Vol. I, 78.

³ K. Kohler, Jewish Theology, op. cit., p. 314; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 7. Cf. C.H. Kraeling, op. cit., p. 157.

⁴ Tosefta, Sanh. 8.4-9. K. Kohler maintains this is the correct reading in opposition to M. Sanh. 4.5. See further, A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 72 n.1 and H. Danby, op. cit., p. 388 and n.4. The quotation is taken from J.E., op. cit., Vol. I, 174.

These quotations were supposed to impress Gentile and Israelite alike with the rationale behind the second of the two great commandments.¹

Beyond this, an orthodox belief in the origin of the race and the universe served not only to enhance the majesty of the one God, but also to reflect the wonder of Israel's divine election. For this reason, it is not surprising that the New Year Festival came to stress the creative acts of Jehovah. Through an effective use of the Psalms and their stress on the omnipotence of God in Creation, a conscious union was sought between the exaltation of God and its corollary, namely, the assured exaltation of His peculiar treasure.²

The Rabbinic interest in the creation of Adam was not primarily motivated by such a rationale. On the contrary, the chagrin over the successive calamities sustained by the nation forced upon Judaism an intensified awareness of sin.³ As a result, a stimulation to examine the source of evil in the world, and a desire to explain its propagation, held sway. Not by chance, the search for the origin of evil in the world led to one of two possibilities. 1) A theory which gained support among the Apocalyptic writers was the story of the Watchers in Genesis 6:1-4. 2) The source favored by the Rabbis and which later gained more or less universal support was Adam, pointing to Genesis ch. 3, as the explanation for the origin of evil in the world.⁴ Hand in hand with this inquisitive attitude toward sin, came the eschatological speculation regarding the restoration of the primeval utopia in the Messianic Age.⁵ This led to the development of a rather

¹Cf. Lev. 19:18. R. Gordis claims, "To the Rabbis, Adam is the symbol of the unity and universality of mankind, and so he becomes the vehicle of the exalted moral instruction." Op. cit., p. 78.

²See W.O.E. Oesterley, "Early Hebrew Festival Rituals," Myth and Ritual, op. cit., p. 128.

³Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 38. Practically the whole of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha support this conclusion.

⁴Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 38.

⁵See E. Schürer, op. cit., p. 130f.; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 39, Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. IV, 888; C.H. Kraeling, op. cit., p. 161. Cf. e.g. 4 Ez. 7.29, 32; 2 Bar. 5.7; T. Levi ch. 18.

elaborate doctrine of the creation of the first man.¹

Apparently under the influence of Iranian mythology, the Jewish speculation treated the formation of Adam in a panegyric fashion. R. Eliezer b. Azariah propounded the view that the original creation of man was a living mass which extended the length and breadth of the earth and reached from earth to heaven.²

In a similar manner the Sibylline Oracles speak of God "who fashioned four-lettered Adam, the first man fashioned, who completes in his name morn and dusk, antarctic and arctic. He too both established the fashion of the form of mortal men."³

While this mental diversion may not have in every case reflected serious theology,⁴ the glory of the First Adam, was apparently considered to be common knowledge.⁵ Thus, the Midrash Rabba says that the angels mistook Adam for a

¹These explanations are not exhaustive. C.H. Kraeling has convincingly argued that the Adam-speculation was to some extent prompted by a confluence of Babylonian, Persian and Old Testament ideas regarding the Primal Man and the original creation. Cf. op. cit., ch. vi, pp. 128-165 and 185; W. Manson, op. cit., p. 178. This in no sense rules out the important modifications which Judaism placed on all of the views which it absorbed (cf. C.H. Kraeling, op. cit., pp. 164f. and W. Manson, op. cit., p. 183). Probably the most noteworthy modification is the fact that Adam in Jewish thought is neither divine nor mythical. On the other hand, many mythical features were adopted to adorn the speculation. Thus, Gen. R. 8.1, refers to the "spirit of Adam" moving on the face of the deep, transposing the Biblical "Spirit of God." Cf. H.L. Ginsberg, "Adam Kadmon," in J.E., Vol. I, 181.

²Cf. Gen. R. 8.1; Sanh. 38b, which ascribes the pronouncement to R. Judah in Rab's name. See Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. III, 325, Vol. IV, 946; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 59, Vol. V, 79; F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 203.

³3.24-27. The date is roughly the second half of the 1st cent. A.D. (cf. A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. II, 371ff. Cf. 2 Enoch 30:13, "And I appointed him a name from the four component parts, from East, West, South and North." A stood for Ἀνατολή; D stood for Δύσις; E stood for Ἐπείρα; and M stood for Μεσημβρία. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 55.

⁴W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 53.

⁵It occurs in such variant types of literature as Ecclus. 49:16, "But above every living thing was the beautiful glory of Adam." Box and Oesterley point to this as the first occurrence of the notion which was later to play so important a part in the Adam-speculation (A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. I, 507). Cf. B. Bathra 58a;

divine being;¹ 2 Enoch refers to him as a "second angel."² Probably the most extravagant opinion of the glory of Adam is found in the Books of Adam and Eve where the Fall of Satan is explained by the latter archangel's refusing to worship Adam.³

There is more than an exaggerated opinion of Adam's original glory implied in these divergent statements. There is an unmistakable further connotation of the universal unity of the race. The descriptions of the actual creation confirm this point. "It has been taught: R. Meir used to say: 'The dust of the first man was gathered from all parts of the earth,' for it is written, 'Thine eyes did see mine unformed substance' (Ps. 139:16), and further it is written, 'The eyes of the Lord run to and fro through the whole earth' (Zech. 4:10).⁴ In the same section of the

F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 207 and refs.; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 60. For the pre-Christian gnostic ideas on the uniqueness of Adam, see L.G. Rylands, The Beginnings of Gnostic Christianity, London, 1940, pp. 142ff. Philo held the same opinion in a different form. The ascription of glory is made to the Heavenly Man whom he distinguishes from the earthly man, created from dust, as the offspring of the Creator in true Platonic fashion. Man in the Imago Dei belongs to the realm of ideas, a type, noumenal, asexual, and incorporeal (cf. De. Mun. Op. par. 69, Loeb Cl. Lib., ed. and trans. F.H. Coulson, London, 1929, Vol. I, 54). The earthly man, by virtue of his creation in replica of so magnificent a model, is thereby also well-favored. Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., pp. 46ff. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 179; C.H. Kraeling, op. cit., p. 177; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. V, 78 n.21. Philo proceeds to draw the conclusion that all men belong to a common unity. This may be seen in an interpretation of the law: "He who kills a man, even though justly and in self-defence, appears to be guilty (hence needs atonement) of bloodshed by reason of the relationship of all mankind to a common father." Moses I.314; Loeb ed. 1935, Vol. VII, 439. On Philo's views on the unity of humanity see S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 54.

¹Gen. R. 8.10.

²30.11.

³Cf. chs. xii-xvii. See also H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 62ff.

⁴Sanh. 38a, Gen. R. 8.1. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. III, 479. In Gen. R. 14.8 and Jerusalem Tal. Naz. 7.56b, the idea that the dust of Adam was gathered from (or kneaded) where the Sanctuary was later to rise for the atonement of all human sin is found (cf. H.L. Ginsberg, op. cit., Vol. V, 73 n.16). K. Kohler comments on the beautiful and certainly original idea of the Rabbis, that sin should never be a permanent or inherent part of man's nature. J.E., Vol. I, op. cit., p. 174.

Talmud, a diversity in the honor or value of distinct races, is not allowed to offset the fundamental unity of mankind. "R. Oshaiah said in Rab's name: 'Adam's trunk came from Babylon, his head from Eretz Israel, his limbs from other lands, and his private parts according to R. Aha, from Akra di Agma.'"¹

In another citation, there is a possible allusion to the assorted colors of different races as suggested by Friedlander:²

The Holy One, blessed by He, spake to the Torah: 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness' (Gen. 1:26)...He (God) began to collect the dust of the first man from the four corners of the world; red, black, white and pale green (which) refers to the body.³

Another earlier source attributes the seven natures which were given Adam, to the seven consistencies which were employed in his creation. Thus it says, "And I gave him seven natures: to the flesh hearing, the eyes for sight, to the soul smell, the veins for touch, the blood for taste, the bones for endurance, to the intelligence sweetness (i.e. enjoyment)." But the flesh was derived from the earth, his blood from the dew, his eyes from the sun, his bones from stone, his intelligence from the swiftness of angels and clouds, his veins and hair from grass and his soul from divine breath and wind.⁴

At a later date, the feature of bisexuality was added to the description of the

¹Sanh. 38a-b. Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 54; F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 203.

²Pirke de-R. Eliezer, op. cit., p. 77 n.2. Ginsberg thinks the colors refer to no more than the distinct elements of man's body, Legends, op. cit., Vol. V, 72.

³Pirke de-R. Eliezer, op. cit., pp. 76f. From the Jer. Targum on Gen. 2:7 comes the idea that the dust was collected from the holy place (as the center of the earth) (cf. Pirke de-R. Eliezer, op. cit., pp. 76f.), and the four parts of the world, mingling it with the water of all the seas and made him (Adam) red, black and white. See K. Kohler, in J.E., op. cit., Vol. I, p. 174.

⁴2 Enoch 30:8ff. Cf. Philo, De Mund, Op., I, 145ff, and 131ff. (Loeb ed. Vol. I, 115f. and I, 102ff.).

original creation of man who was androgynous.¹ The full intention of the writers who proposed so fantastic and mythological a reconstruction of the original creation of man, cannot be examined in this brief presentation. It is enough to maintain that the fundamental purpose of the Jewish teachers was the promotion of the conception of the unity of the whole race.

The statements given thus far indicate symbolic unity of the race through the original creation. Still more pertinent are those fanciful descriptions of the race as it was incorporated in Adam. Exodus Rabba mentions the first man being adorned with the descendants which were yet to be born from him. They are pictured as individuals attached to his hair, nose, ears, and so on, over the whole of his body.² Other passages speak of God's causing all the generations of men, both righteous and wicked, to pass before Adam, saying to him, "See wherefore thou has brought death upon the righteous."³ R. Johanan b. Zakkai and R. Akiba interpreted the passage, "They did eat, and the eyes of both of them were opened," as Adam and Eve seeing the dire consequences of their sin upon all coming generations.⁴

¹ Gen. R. 8.1. Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 453; Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. I, 802; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 66, Vol. V, 88 n.42.

² Ex. R. 40.3. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. II, 174.

³ Tanh. Ber. par. 29 in G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 476. Cf. Gen. R. 8.8, Abodah Zar. 5a; Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. II, 173; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 61; V, 75. Evidently the manner of the presentation of these souls was conceived in the same way as all Israel was present at Sinai: "All souls were present then although their bodies were not yet created." Tanh. B. 8.25b in R.A., op. cit., p. 108; Cf. Authorized Jewish Prayer Book, op. cit., p. 5; Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 227. Note Hag. 12b for the widely held view that the spirits and souls await corporeality in the seventh heaven (Araboth) (cf. A. Cohen, op. cit., p. 83). Cf. Wisd. 8.19. According to Ab. Zar. 5a the Messiah awaits the exhausting of all the souls destined to inhabit bodies for his advent (cf. Yeb. 62a).

⁴ Gen. R. 19.10. Cf. K. Kohler, Jewish Theology, op. cit., p. 222.

More to the point, is another opinion ascribed to R. Johanan, namely, that all souls until the end of the world were created in the six days of Creation and consequently in the Garden of Eden.¹ Some opinions refer to the souls of all men as a part of Adam's soul, but were destined to inhabit bodies in subsequent generations.²

All of the divergent intentions behind the Adam-speculation cannot be seen in this brief citation of some of the reconstructions of the creation. W.D. Davies suggests that two dominant interests color most of these passages: 1) an emphasis on the unity of the race, and 2) the universal responsibility of love.³ While these sum up the general purpose of those propounding these theories, they reflect a conception of solidarity which coupled with views on the universality of sin confirm the contention that Early Judaism held a very strong conception of the unity binding all men into one totality.

2. The Implications of Eschatological Speculation. - Our previous discussion of the eschatological speculation of the Rabbis regarding Israel's unity apply here also. Beyond that, it is important to note that Adam as the head and master of the race is the microcosm⁴ of the Kingdom of God. In this role he invites the whole of the creation to clothe God with majesty and might that it might find favor in His eyes.⁵ The reason that man can fulfill this duty is founded in his

¹Cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., pp. 217f. H.L. Ginsberg claims that this doctrine is of Christian origin (cf. Rom. 5:14, I Cor. 15:22). Legends, op. cit., Vol. V, 75 n.19. If that is the case, it is questionable why the Kabbalah later expanded the doctrine unless it did under Hellenistic and Stoic influence.

²Cf. Gen. R. passim. Cf. H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 56. Cf. Mishna Sanh. 4.5, where the witness in capital cases is responsible for the blood, not only of the victim, but also of the blood of his posterity (which should have been born of him) to the end of the world. Such was the case with Cain who slew his brother, for it is written, "The bloods of thy brother cry," (Gen. 4:10). The plural refers to his blood and that of his posterity.

³Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 53.

⁴Cf. H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 49; V, 64f.

⁵Gen. R. 9.4.

endowment with free will epitomized in the two inclinations. Through sin's incursion into the creation, the recognition of the divine Kingship of God was corrupted in darkness which reigned twenty generations between Adam and Abraham.¹ With the institution of the covenant, Israel became the locus of the Kingdom, awaiting the purging of humanity and the restoration of the universal domain of God.² The earnest desire for the accomplishment of this Hope is found in the Amidah-prayer for the New Year Service (Rosh-ha-shanah):

Now therefore, O Lord God, impose Thine awe upon all Thy works and Thy dread upon all that Thou hast created, that all works may fear Thee and all creatures prostrate themselves before Thee; that they may all form a single band to do Thy will with a perfect heart, even as we know, O Lord our God, that dominion is Thine, strength is in Thine hand ...³

The restoration of the disunited race of men to the original unity is the culmination of the Jewish conception of history itself. We may note an example of this in the Testament of Levi:

And he (the Messiah) shall open the gates of paradise,
And he shall remove the threatening sword against Adam,
And he shall give to the saints to eat of the tree of life,
And the spirit of holiness shall be upon them,
And Beliar shall be bound by him,
And he shall give power to his children to tread upon evil spirits.⁴

The Messiah was expected to be the one re-enacting the life of Adam in reverse.⁵ As he did so, the whole of the creation would be implicated in the restoration of the primeval unity. Throughout the corruption of the race, and its restoration the principle of solidarity is an inviolate law of history itself.

¹Cf. M. Aboth 5.1.

²See S. Hanson's excellent discussion, op.cit., pp. 20ff.

³Jewish Authorized Prayer Book, op.cit., p. 239. Note also the petitions for the universal restoration in the Alenu prayer, Ibid., pp. 76f.

⁴Ch. 18.10ff. Cf. C.H. Kraeling, op.cit., p. 161; Bousset, op.cit., pp. 260.

⁵Cf. supra pp. 143ff. and infra pp. 279ff.

The Solidarity of the Human Race in Sin

Introduction. - The second paramount factor in Jewish theological speculation which confirmed the solidarity of the race was the recognition of the universality of sin. It is the counterpart to the admission that all men are brothers because of the common fatherhood of Adam. We have already shown how strong Israel's sense of corporate implication in sin had become in this period. But moral defilement was by no means confined to Israel. Indeed, the Gentiles were by definition "sinners",¹ "unclean," heathen, invariably worse than Israel.² But the holiness of the Elect Race was ascribed to it only in the interest of emphasizing the contrast. The truth of the universality of sin became increasingly impressed on the Jewish mind through the conviction that an inseparable connection existed between punishment and sin.³ The heavy hand of divine chastisement on Israel left no alternative to the Hebrew mind other than the admission that it was the national desert. But whence came this moral pollution, the inveterate tendency to evil? If a solution to this problem might be found, and the nature of sin defined, the application to Israel's problem might effect a cure which would in turn inaugurate the New Age.

1. The Search for the Origin of Sin in the World. - The attempt on the part of Jewish thinkers to locate the source of evil and the cause for its universality must engage our attention first. One more or less assured premise held by Early Judaism was the conviction that death and the deteriorating effect of

¹So, Paul, "We who are Jews by nature and not of ἔθνῳν ἀμαρτωλοί..." Gal. 2:15. Cf. H.G. Marsh, The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism, Manchester, 1941, p. 7, n. 2.

²This idea is especially prominent in 2 Baruch, in which the author repeatedly must question the justice of God in allowing the Gentiles to prosper at the expense of Israel's calamity. When the Sib. Oracles characterize Israel as the guiltless race of men" (4.136), this contrast is in perspective.

³The universality of death confirmed the inclusive character of sin (cf. Shab. 55a). Tobit explicitly affirms this conviction, e.g. in 3.1-6, 14.4ff. Cf. F.R. Tennant, op.cit., p. 121.

sin were not the original lot on mankind.¹ A citation from the Book of Enoch might be considered normative: "For men were created exactly like the angels, to the intent that they should continue pure and righteous, and death which destroys everything, could not have taken hold of them; but through this their knowledge, they are perishing."² The writer of the Wisdom of Solomon concurs with this opinion, "God created man for immortality and made him the image of his own peculiar nature; but by the envy of the devil death entered into the world and they who are of his party make experience of it."³ In these passages a generic conception of mankind corresponds to the unity of men in Adam; consequently, the glory of the original man is given to all men.

If we may draw a distinction between the more official doctrine of the Rabbis and the popular theology of the Apocalyptic writers, we will note two features. 1) Both agree on the original majesty and phenomenal attributes of Adam at formation. 2) The Rabbis held a modified view of the Fall,⁴ clinging to the doctrine of the yetzer hara,⁵ because it neither denied the freedom of the

¹N.P. Williams, op.cit., p. 57. C.H. Kraeling distinguishes two opposing views on the origin of mankind in the post-exile books of the Old Testament. Pre-exilic thought was pessimistic, viewing generic man in his frailty and sinfulness, but later thought, under the influence of the Iranian mythology resulted in the ascription of glory to the original man. Op.cit., pp. 151ff.

²69.11. The knowledge referred to, is that imparted by the fallen angels.

³2.23f. Cf. 1.13; G.F. Moore, op.cit., Vol. I, 475. That there would be no death without sin, is the natural inference from the story of the Fall in Genesis. Cf. 2 Enoch 30:16.

⁴N.P. Williams, op.cit., p. 59. R.Meir claimed that Adam's proportions were reduced by his sinning from the extent of all space to 100 yards. Gen. R. 12.6 claims that Adam, through sin, lost glory, immortality (lit. life), his height, the fruit of the earth, the fruit of trees, and the luminaries. Every generation has shared his deprivation except two. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op.cit., Vol. IV, 946f.; H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op.cit., Vol. V, 126. Note further ibid., p. 102 n.87 and Vol. I, 79,82.

⁵I.e. the "evil inclination" (Gen. 6:5) Cf. infra. pp. 162ff.

human will nor affected the value of repentance.¹ The popular theology held with less loathing, a view that Adam's progeny had in fact inherited certain effects and consequences of the first transgression.

a. The Theory of the Watchers. - One widely held view regarding the origin and dissemination of sin had nothing to do with Adam. Rather, the corruption of all flesh including "men, cattle, beasts, and birds," (cf. I Enoch 7.5f.), came as a result of the intermarriage of rebellious angels and the daughters of men.²

The locus classicus of this hypothesis is found in I Enoch, chapters 6-16. In full detail the angels are named with their leader "Semjaza." For their lawless deeds they are bound and confined to the abyss of fire. Their bastard sons are destroyed because they had wronged mankind.³ The Testament of Reuben curiously

lays the blame on the daughters of men who by cunning allurements tempted them.⁴

A close evaluation of the evidence preserved in our sources does not support the conclusion that the Watchers were actually the cause either for the origin of evil in the earth nor an explanation for the universality of sin. These passages do not give to them, the representative place of Adam (cf. infra 156ff); their sin implicates only their own generation.⁵ If there is any casual relationship between

¹Cf. J. Abelson, op.cit., p. 311; and, on repentance, J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, op.cit., p. 519.

²Cf. Jub. 5.2f. and 7.21. Compare with this view the parallel assertion that, "Unclean demons began to lead the children of the sons of Noah astray, and to make to err and destroy them," which in turn confirmed the presence of sin in the world again. Jub. 10.1. See F.R. Tennant, op.cit., p. 193.

³10.15. Cf. T. Naphtali 3.5 where the desolation of the whole earth is attributed to the Watchers. According to Jub. 7.21, they were the efficient cause for the flood and made the beginning of uncleanness. This theory was also held by the Zadokite Party (cf. Fragments, 3.4-4.1), but the Fall of the Watchers was due to their surrender to their "evil imagination."

⁴5.6f. The original good intention of the Watchers is affirmed in Jub. 4:15.

⁵This must be modified by recognizing that the offspring of the giants (disembodied spirits) cause a great deal of trouble and evil among men. Cf. I Enoch 15.8-12.

their evil and that of mankind, it must be sought in the sphere of influence or imitation.

b. The Theory of the Seduction of Eve. - Another crude strain of thought may be traced in Jewish sources in which sinful pollution of the race finds its source in the seduction of Eve by the Serpent.¹ "On this account, he (Satan) conceived designs against Adam; in such a manner he entered and deceived Eve. But he did not touch Adam."² This hypothesis was used to explain the initiation of the principle of death. Therefore, Adam chides Eve, "What hast thou done? A great plague hast thou brought upon us, transgression and sin for all our generations."³

It is more than likely that the Rabbinic expansion of the notion of the seduction of Eve into a Jewish counterpart of Original Sin was founded on the Apocalyptic theory. While Ecclesiasticus goes on record declaring, "From a woman did sin originate and because of her we all must die,"⁴ the Talmud refers to a poison or filth which in consequence of its injection into Eve, continued in her

¹ Cf. F.R. Tennant, op. cit., pp. 156, 168; N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 57. 2 Enoch asserts that death came to Adam by Eve, (30.17), and the widowed mother of the seven martyred brothers says, "Nor did the false, beguiling Serpent sully the purity of my maidenhood" (4 Macc. 18.8). See F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 212, for Rabbinic traces of this theory.

² 2 Enoch 31.6. Cf. Bousset, pp. 408f. The emphasis on this theory for the origin of sin was largely promoted by Judaism's radical condemnation of immortality. "Lust is the root and beginning of every sin" (Apoc. of Moses 19.3) illustrates the point.

³ The Books of Adam and Eve, 44.2; cf. 35.2. For Rabbinic parallels see, Gen. R. 18.6, Ex. R. 28.2, Sanh. 59b, Sot. 9b, Yeb. 103b, and Ab. Zar. 22b. Contrast Gen. R. 19.12. In the Targums, note Eccles. 7:29 (God made man upright), "But the serpent and the woman led him astray, and caused death to be inflicted upon him and upon all the inhabitants of the earth." Cf. also on Ruth 4:22.

⁴ 25.24; cf. 14.17b, ἡ γὰρ διαθήκη ἀπὸ αἰῶρος θανάτῳ ἀποθαινεύουσα. Note Apoc. of Moses 14.2; 32.1f., where Eve cries, "I have sinned before Thee and all sin hath begun through my doing in the creation." Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. III, 226.

descendants through the process of procreation.¹ Although this is not a doctrine of Original Sin in the later Christian sense,² the affinities are self-evident. The normative character of Eve's action in introducing the principle of sin (uncleanness) and death to succeeding generations, was not seen in isolation, but drew heavily on the feature of solidarity. Thus, the Mishna attributes death during child-birth to three transgressions: 1) lack of care in the observation of the rules of purification, 2) failure in the separation of priest's portion of the dough, 3) carelessness in the kindling of the light.³ This provided the pessimistic homily on woman's share in the Fall. We may quote the summary of F. Gavin:

...Woman had shed man's blood, hence the institution of the laws of purification (niddah); woman had brought disgrace on man who is the halla (i.e. priest's portion) of the dough of creation, hence woman's duties in regard to halla; upon woman was laid the third obligation of lighting the lamp, 'because she had quenched (the light of) Adam's soul.'⁴

The normative role of Eve became the lot of all women, but did not fully explain the universality of sin in itself.⁵

¹Yeb. 103b. See also Ab. Zar. 22b, Shab. 146a. Since this baneful influence was removed from Israel through the Torah, the Gentiles continue to be "like a man with an unclean issue," i.e., unclean in the highest degree. Cf. Ab. Zar. 36b, Nid. 34b; F. Gavin, op. cit., p. 30.

²Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. III, 71; F.R. Tennant, op. cit., p. 176; Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 240; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 34.

³Shab. 2.6.

⁴Op. cit., p. 85. Cf. Gen. R. 46.13 and H.L. Ginsberg, op. cit., Vol. I, 67, 78.

⁵F.R. Tennant notes that although the belief in Eve's pollution was widespread, it does not appear to have been used to explain the universal sinfulness of mankind. Op. cit., p. 176. He is on less firm ground in his objection to any moral incapacity in mankind due to Eve's transgression in Ecclesiasticus. Tennant claims that even though through it sin entered, and that in spite of all men descending from Adam (17.1), sin is due only to a natural and essential frailty. "The Teaching of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom on the Introduction of Sin and Death," J.T.S., Vol. II, p. 212.

c. The Theory of the Determinative Role of Adam. - After all is said and done, the primal hypothesis adopted by Early Judaism as accounting for the origin of evil blamed Adam for human misery in general¹ and death in particular.²

A collation of pertinent texts from the Early Jewish period indicates a preponderance of evidence supporting the view, that beyond the implications of his own punishment, Adam also brought death upon the whole race. Thus, in the very early extra-canonical Book of Wisdom, death is man's inheritance from Adam.³ The difficulty is that although 2.23f. (quoted supra) is probably a reference to the Fall, the death is apparently moral.⁴ With the Rabbis, there is no doubting the point. As G.F. Moore affirms:

That Adam's sin involved all his posterity, the righteous as well as the wicked, in death, is the consistent teaching of the Rabbis...The ancient conceptions of solidarity made this theory unquestioned that the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children. It was the doctrine of experience as well as of Scripture.⁵

In support of this contention a few of the many possible citations may be noted. From the Sifra on Leviticus, R. Jose said:

If you wish to know of the reward of the righteous in the world to come, consider the case of Adam. One single negative command was given him. This he violated, and see how many deaths have been decreed for him and for all his generations unto the end of time.⁶

¹Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. I, 19f.; III, 246.

²F. Prat, The Theology of S. Paul, trans. J.L. Stoddard, London, 1945, Vol. I, 440.

³Cf. 7.1.

⁴Note 3.1, "But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God." Cf. F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 124; "The Teaching of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom on the introduction of Sin and Death," op. cit., p. 218. This passage evidently reflects Hellenistic influence and may therefore be compared with Philo's view of the "Fall." Generic man (Adam) created in the image of God dies "ethically." As for his body and soul (irrational), they are mortal by nature. De Mun. Op., op. cit., 134f., 145ff (Loeb ed. I, 106, 114ff.). The Fall might well be described as individual, for in the human soul's fall from the transcendental sphere to the material plane, it must be characterized by evil since the finite and material are evil. Cf. N.P. Williams, op. cit., and S. Holmes in A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. II, 531.

⁵Op. cit., Vol. I, 476. Cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 238, J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, op. cit., p. 517.

⁶27a in R.A., op. cit., p. 205; cf. p. 543.

Another citation from Sifre Deuteronomy says:

Ye are the sons of Adam the first man, who brought the sentence of death upon you and on all the generations of his descendants who come after him until the end of all generations.¹

For contemporary and pre-Christian declarations to the same effect, ample support may be gathered from the Apocalyptic literature. From the The Secrets of Enoch we may note a typical citation:

And I saw all forefathers from all time with Adam and Eve, and I sighed and broke into tears and said of the ruin of their dishonor: 'Woe is me for my infirmity and for that of my forefathers' and thought in my heart and said: 'Blessed is the man who has not been born or who has been born and shall not sin before the Lord's face, that he come not into this place, nor bring the yoke of this place.'²

This passage, as well as the Rabbinic haggada, assumes that Adam has caused death to rule in the world of men, but maintains strenuously that if an individual should keep himself from sin, he should in turn be preserved from death.³ Enoch and Elijah, archetypal figures from the Old Testament, were cited in favor of this contention in conjunction with seven others.⁴ Some righteous men, who despite unblameworthy lives died, caused a problematic contradiction. Thus, in the case of Moses, whose death was not the judgment of his own sin, Rabbinic lore depicts God addressing Moses:

I announced death to thee with the word, 'Behold,' saying, 'Behold, thy days approach that thou must die,' because I wanted to point out to thee that thou diest only because thou art a descendant of Adam upon whose sons I had pronounced death with the word, 'Behold,' saying to the angels, 'Behold,' the man is become as one of us...⁵

¹Par. 323. Cf. Gen. R. 16.6; Erubim 18b.

²4.1f. See further, e.g., 2 Bar. 17.3, 23.4, 19.8, and possibly 54.15 and 56.6, which ascribe premature death to the corporate judgment of Adam's transgression.

³Cf. Gen. R. 8.11.

⁴Cf. Pres. R. 76a; Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. III, 227f.; Vol. I, 754; Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 237.

⁵H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. III, 423. Cf. Gen. R. 9.8, Tan. B., 5.11. Regarding the view that the transgression of Adam is the cause of the death of others who were free from sin, see, Sifre Deut. par. 339; Shab. 55b.

Such examples of righteousness were such an exception, that the Rabbis did not feel obliged to solve the contradiction between universal death and an individual dying in spite of his innocence. The dictum, "There is no death without sin,"¹ in the vast majority of instances, raised no questions at all. Thus the problem of the justice of Adam's judgment falling on his descendants was resolved in the appeal to personal desert and individual responsibility.² For this reason, the justice of God was not impugned as the angel implied in his answer of Ezra's difficulty: "Ask no more about the multitude of those who perish, for they themselves having freedom given them, spurned the Most High, and despised his law and abandoned his ways."³

Some passages, in the Apocalyptic literature especially, attribute broader consequences to the original transgression of Adam. These form a sort of peroration of human misery. Thus the racial effects of Adam's sin are listed in 2 Baruch: 1) untimely death, 2) grief, 3) anguish, 4) pain and trouble, 5) disease, 6) a demanding Sheol, 7) the begetting of children, 8) passion,

¹Shab. 55a. Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 247; "Sin," in Bible Key Words (T.W.N.T.), trans. J.R. Coates, New York, 1951, p. 45.

²Cf. N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 74 and refs.; J.D. Eisenstein, op. cit., p. 377.

³4 Ez. 8.55f. Cf. 2 Bar. 54.19, "Adam is not the cause, save of his own soul, but each one of us has been the Adam of his own soul." See G.F. Moore, Vol. I, op. cit., pp. 455, 475; F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., pp. 218, 220.

If the Jewish religious philosopher had been pressed for an explanation of the divine decree involving all men in Adam's sin, he could have suggested that it was an example of the inscrutable laws of heaven which judge more comprehensively than do human laws. The distinction is found in M. B. Kama 6.4, "If one causes a fire to break out at the hands of a deaf-mute, an imbecile, or a minor, he is not culpable by the laws of men, but he is culpable by the laws of Heaven." (Cf. S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 191). M.-J. LaGrange notes that the Mishna contains certain texts which regard the sin of Adam as the sin of humanity but this is due to Hebrew thought in which the assimilation of the one in the other is natural. St. Paul Epître aux Romains, Paris, 1916, pp. 117f. On the other hand, the Jewish writers may have had a relative view of sin, in which although one could be called righteous he might not have been completely so, in God's sight. In a summary statement by F. Weber, our conclusion may be given succinctly: "The

9) humiliation of humanity, 10) the languishing of goodness.¹ The whole gamut of human ills is the fruit of the original judgment on Adam's sin. The involvement of the whole race in the judgment of Adam is precisely the same explanation which was used to solve the problem of God's judgment of the whole of Israel for the transgression of a part. In other words, it is the reapplication of the principle of corporate justice within the group. In the case of mankind, the group is larger, but in reality does not differ in kind from the solidarity of Israel as one of its constituent parts.

The further question of the relationship of universal sin to the original transgression is more complex. Various solutions were tendered on this subject. The Letter of Aristeas, preserving the alleged answers of the seventy Jewish wisemen to the questions of Ptolemy, emphasizes the interaction of influence and the natural inclination. Thus one answers, "Everyone has a natural tendency toward the pursuit of pleasure;"² another says, "Men catch their depravities and

Rabbis held that Adam's was not the sin of the race, but his own sin. Man is not made a sinner on the ground of his descent from Adam, but merely through his own act. How, when the sin is not transmitted to the race, can its punishment be transmitted?...But as a matter of fact, the human race is subjected to death. Death and the Angel of Death have, through Adam become active in the world. The realities of life therefore appear to be in inexplicable opposition to the righteousness of God." Jüdische Theologie, op. cit., p. 249. For support of this statement, see, Pes. R. Kahana 167a-b in R.A., op. cit., p. 553.

¹ 56.6. Cf. Jub. 3.28f. and the Books of Adam and Eve, 34.2, which refer to seventy blows which were appointed Adam in all parts of his body, but included also his race. More than one opinion can be found which asserts that God gave Adam an opportunity to repent, promising annulment of the effects of the Fall, but Adam's decisive objection, left the divine judgment in effect. Num. R. 13.3. Cf. 2 Bar. 17.3, where added time did not profit Adam, but brought shorter years to the lives of his progeny. A contradictory opinion is found in Pirke de-R. Eliezer, op. cit., p. 147, claiming that Adam did repent and that he was forgiven to exemplify the value of repentance to future generations. Cf. H.L. Ginsberg, Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 86ff.

² Par. 108; cf. 277f. Such is also Philo's interpretation of the Serpent of Genesis 3 (cf. F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 136).

become miserable through association with bad men."¹ A teaching emphasized in the Sibylline Oracles (Bks. I and II), is that the weakness of the flesh, making the avoidance of sin so difficult, is a racial characteristic. Both Enoch (Secrets) and 2 Baruch suggest affinities to the doctrine of Original Sin.²

It is the pseudepigraphic writer(s)³ of 4 Ezra who comes closer to the Christian view of sin. In the words of Oesterley and Box:

Hitherto every sin was regarded as an isolated act, unconnected with anything in human nature inherently, a thing which could be avoided if man so willed, but being committed could easily be obliterated. In this book, however, it is taught that the whole human race is involved in sin, and that the reason for the universal prevalence of sin is to be sought in the innate badness of the human heart...So steeped is the world in sin that it seems to the writer of the book that the only remedy lies in a new age; a fresh start must be made, and a new Era will dawn, then all sorrow will be turned into joy for sin will be rooted out.⁴

In chapter 3.7f., the heavy judgment on Adam for one transgression (his own death and that of his generations), is contrasted with the punishment his progeny should expect for walking after their own way. In chapter 7, solidarity comes still more to the fore. The writer cries in anguish:

¹ Par. 130.

² Cf. 2 Enoch 41.1f. quoted above, in which Tennant sees a definite implication of the doctrine of depravity through the sin of Adam, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 210. Compare also 3 Macc. 3.22, Wisdom, 12.10.

According to R. Mackintosh, 2 Baruch is the unique location of a doctrine of original sin which has not been influenced by Christian thought. Christianity and Sin, London, 1913, p. 53. This opinion is contested accurately (especially if the book is taken as a unity) by H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op. cit., p. 35, and F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 216; cf. p. 229.

³ See G.H. Box's discussion of the authorship in A.P.O.T., op. cit., Vol. II, 552f.

⁴ Oesterley and Box, op. cit., pp. 238f. Cf. 4 Ezra 7.17ff. The position adopted in this pseudepigraph is not implicitly different from that of the Old Testament. There is also some kinship to the views evinced in this work in the Wisdom of Solomon. The writer of the latter extols the mercy of God in destroying the Caananites slowly, thus giving them opportunity to repent, even though He knew that their nature was evil, "and their wickedness inborn...For they were

O Adam, what hast thou done! For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are they descendants! For what does it profit us that the eternal age is promised to us, whereas we have done the works that bring death!¹

In vs. 68, the solidarity in sin is still more explicitly declared in view of the expressed doctrine that all who are born are defiled with iniquities and full of sin.² The core of the doctrine of sin in 4 Ezra is found in chapters three and four:

For the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise also, all who are born of him. Thus the infirmity became inveterate; the Law indeed was in the heart of the people, but (in conjunction) with the evil germ; so what was good departed and the evil remained.³

In the following chapter we read:

A grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how large a quantity of the fruit of sin hath it borne and will it bear until the threshing floor appear.⁴

Sin is thus a living power which controls the world of men at its deepest level.⁵ It is organic, growing in the human tree from generation to generation, as the seed reproduces in kind its parent legume type. This view

a seed accursed from the beginning" (12.10). One very noticeable difference, however, is that Wisdom absolves Israel from the corporate implication of universal sin.

¹Vvs. 118f. See F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 229.

²Curiously, this description apparently includes Israel.

³3.21f. See N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 79.

⁴4.30f. C.R. Smith comments appropriately on this passage, "2nd (4th) Ezra 4.28-32 points out that 'a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning,' and all sin is the harvest of this one sin which is as the recurrent sowing of seed and reaping of harvest since the unity of all men with Adam is assumed (cf. 3.7)." The Bible Doctrine of Sin, London, 1953, p. 107. G.F. Moore rules out the inference of an "infection of sin" in this passage on the basis of statements elsewhere in the book." Op. cit., Vol. I, 477. Cf. e.g. 7.127ff. and 8.56; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 33.

⁵"Sin" in Bible Key Words (T.W.N.T.), op. cit., pp. 43f.

of sin is based on the conception of heredity which has made of all men a single unity through birth; it is comparable to the ethnic unity of Israel.¹

2. The Normative Rabbinic Solution of the Problem of the Universality of Sin. -

The cor malignum which the writer of 4 Ezra considers to be the inheritance of every man from Adam² corresponds roughly to the Rabbinic yetzer hara.³ The norm of Rabbinic speculation, however, must be distinguished from the doctrine of the pseudepigraph. The yetzer hara was the evil motive or sinful inclination which is inherent in the race. But the yetzers (hara and hatob) were provided Adam at his creation,⁴ and are not passed from father to son through procreation.⁵ Various views are tendered by recent writers on the subject of the influence of the transgression of Adam on the yetzer hara. Some would maintain that the Rabbis thought of the sin of Adam as enslaving the evil inclination in human nature.⁶

¹C.R. Smith suggests that the use of the word seed (cf. 4.30) is equivalent to "semen," and may therefore be an allusion to the sexual act, even though Eve is not mentioned. Op. cit., p. 107.

²Cf. 3.20, 22, 26, 4.4.

³F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 265. In modern psychological terms it seems to be equivalent to the libido as defined by Jung. It is largely, though not exclusively sexual (cf. N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 68; W.D. Davies op. cit., p. 21). In S. Freud's system, the yetzer would correspond rather closely to the "id," the seat of primitive desires and instincts (cf. L. Engel, "Sigmund Freud," Science Digest, Vol. 35, no. 6, June, 1954, Chicago, p. 82.

⁴Ber. 61a, Sanh. 91b. Cf. R. Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 54; F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 204. Note also 4 Ezra 4.30; Ecclus. 15.14.

⁵Since the origin of the evil yetzer is attributed to God, and the creationist view of the origin of the soul was held by the Rabbis (cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., pp. 219f.), it follows that the yetzer should have been held to have been put into the heart at its inception (cf. Sanh. 91b). Cf. N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 69; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 25; S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 253.

⁶Cf. e.g. F.V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, Leipzig, 1931, pp. 11f.; F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. I, 440; H.L. Ginsberg claims that the evil inclination was one of the evils decreed upon Adam. Legends, op. cit., Vol. I, 79.

F.C. Porter maintains that the Rabbis did not even think of the original transgression as strengthening the yetzer.¹

There is less difference of opinion regarding the seat of the yetzer, that is, in the heart or the inner self.² It is at the worst a powerful dynamic incentive to sin. Although it may be successfully resisted, when the individual surrenders to its demands, he finds the power of evil to grow upon him as a current.³ One Rabbinic opinion cited in the Talmud held that, "Satan, the evil yetzer, and the Angel of Death," were one.⁴ Nothing conclusive can be maintained from such a statement. It is enough to see a close relationship between the yetzer and Satan as the source of temptation, which in turn produces death (identified with the Angel of Death) for those who succumb to its demands.⁵

¹"The Yecer Hara," in Biblical and Semitic Studies, Yale Bicentennial Publications, New Haven, 1901.

²N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 65; Bousset, op. cit., pp. 404f. Since the evil impulse is original in the creation of the individual, it is not evil in itself. R. Samuel b. Nahman affirms that it is an essential part of human nature, declared to be good, by God (Gen. R. 9.7). Cf. Sanh. 107b; G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 482ff., W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 22 n.3, S. Schechter, op. cit., pp. 264ff.

³S..Schechter, op. cit., p. 249.

⁴B. Bathra 16a. Cf. Ecclus. 21.27, "When the ungodly curseth Satan, he curseth his own soul." In Kid. 81a, the evil yetzer is half-personified as an evil spirit, separate from man, but which can, by conjuration or effort, be rid. Cf. R.A., op. cit., p. 298. In the T. Asher 1.9, the clause is found: "...seeing that the treasure of the inclination is filled with an evil spirit." Cf. 1.8 and T. Benj. 6.1, where good men are free from Beliar's control. In the Manual of Discipline, mention is made of the two spirits, i.e. of truth and of perversion. Col. 3.18f. "In these (two spirits) are the families of all mankind; and in their divisions do all their hosts receive an inheritance." 4.15. These apparently refer to the two yetzers (cf. 4.23). Note the "spirit of deceit," in the T. Judah 20.1 and the prince of deceit in T. Sim. 2.7; T. Jud. 19.4.

⁵Cf. Kid. 30b where the yetzer grows stronger every day, seeking to kill man. Cf. Suk. 52b; Ned. 32b. On the other hand it is good, for without it a man would not build, marry or beget children. Cf. F. Weber, S.A.S.P.T., op. cit., p. 204; S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism, Philadelphia, 1908, p. 35; Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, op. cit., p. 244.

The antidote for the evil inclination is the Law.¹ For this reason, there is a constant interchange between the yetzer hatob (the good inclination) and the Torah in the Rabbinic writings.² The battle for the control of the individual is waged in the heart.³ The personification of the yetzer hara as a totality is used as a figure by R. Judah to predict the freedom of the individual from temptation in the Age to Come. "In the world to come, God will bring the Evil Impulse and slay it in the presence of the righteous and the wicked."⁴

Despite the impossibility of affirming any dogmatic opinions regarding the Rabbinic view of the incursion of sin and its subsequent control of the actions of man, a few general conclusions may be listed. There is apparently a more or less fundamental difference between the Rabbinic views and those of the Apocalyptic writers. In the latter, a more intense view of the universal sinfulness of the whole race dominates the scene. There is a great reliance on the conception of the inter-relationship of men within an organic whole so that beginning with Adam, there is a solidarity of sin which envelops mankind of all generations. The transgression of Adam is posited as the fuse of this corporate involvement in evil.⁵ The Rabbis, on the other hand, held to a

¹B. Bathra 16a, Kid. 30b. Cf. F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 116; Bousset, op. cit., p. 405. Others would say repentance. Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 489; W.D. Davies, op. cit., pp. 24f.

²C.R. Smith, op. cit., p. 108. The same inter-change is found in 4 Ezra. Cf. 3.19, 9.30f., 7.21, 8.6.

³Cf. T. Asher 5.8. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. IV, 466f.

⁴Suk. 55a.

⁵4 Ezra 3.7. E.J. Bicknell suggests on the basis of the relationship which the Mishna posits between the sin of Adam and the sin of the race means that the idea is as old as the 3rd Cent. B.C., The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin, London, 1923, p. 21. See F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., pp. v-ix; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., pp. 136ff.

considerably more modified view of the interrelationship of sin and the unity of the race. They propounded a more or less individualistic responsibility for the universality of sin in the race. While the opportunity or incentive to sin approaches man from without, the yetzer responds to produce the actual temptation.¹ Man's weakness, particularly without the Torah, makes him hopelessly susceptible to sin, which explains why there have been so few down through history who have been completely perfect.² As F.C. Porter has pointed out, "The Jews never regarded the idea that the yetzer became evil solely through man's sin as adequate. It must rather have explained his sin."³ Thus in conclusion, it becomes evident that the solution of the paradox between Adam's implicating the race in his condemnation and the universality of sin as the result of individual choice, was really never discovered.⁴

Conclusion

The content of the Early Jewish literature reveals that in spite of a conscious relating of ideas to the Old Testament⁵ and ancient historical tradition, there are distinctive modifications in thought and belief.⁶ Rabbinic sources

¹Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, 481. The impulses are not evil; the temptation is subjective. Ibid., p. 482.

²Note supra.

³Op. cit., p. 118. So also H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, op. cit., p. 120. Cf. C. Guignebert, op. cit., p. 112; W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, Edinburgh, 1917, p. 243.

⁴Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., pp. 33f.

⁵M. Kadushin calls the relationship, "a living bond." The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 298. Cf. R.A., op. cit., p. 351.

⁶H.St.J. Thackeray, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op. cit., p. 3. Cf. MacGregor and Purdy, op. cit., pp. 70f., 76; Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., p. 292.

reveal on the one hand, a more organic frame of reference. Many new emphases replaced the old. The nature and implications of the Jewish modifications cannot be exhaustively discussed, but a few of the more important points may be cited.

The fundamental conception of the nation as a corporate personality in the Old Testament is altered in the period of Early Judaism.¹ The opinions on corporate justice² and the interpretation of the Pesach celebration remained, to a large extent, unmodified. At the same time, the unity of Israel became increasingly an idealistic and theological dogma, in contrast to the more primitive solidarity of the social consciousness in the Old Testament period.³ At the same time, the contact with the outside world in general and the Greek culture in particular, introduced a new awareness of the individual which made the ancient conception of the organic unity of the group less acceptable.⁴ The representative roles of the king and priest were realized only sporadically at best, only

¹Note Mek. II, 200, and the interpretation of the principle of oscillation. Cf. Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., p. 263.

²M. Kadushin, Organic Thinking, op. cit., p. 268. Cf. e.g. Gen. R. 53.18: "Master of the universe, 'wilt thou bring up a well for a man (Ishmael) who in the future will cause thy children to die of thirst'? Said He to them, 'What is Ishmael now'? They answer, '(Now he is) righteous.' Whereupon He said, 'I deal with man according to his deserts at the moment.'" Note that the angels identify Ishmael with his descendants and demand his destruction on the basis of corporate justice. Other examples have been given in the discussion above.

³Note e.g., the manner in which the Rabbis broadened the conception of the priest-class to include all of Israel (particularly after the destruction of the Temple, cf. M. Kid. 4.1); hence, the extension of the ritual practice of hand-washing, which was only an injunction for priests in the Bible. Cf. M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 293; Organic Thinking, op. cit., pp. 222f.

⁴See F.V. Filson, op. cit., p. 5. M. Kadushin remarks, "In fine, the greater concern with the individual and the concomitant intensification of the inward life are apparent in every phase of rabbinic theology." Organic Thinking, op. cit., p. 224. Cf. Macgregor and Purdy, op. cit., p. 77. This does not deny that the Rabbis held that the Community received the prior claim; individuals were still recognized as a part of it. Cf. R.A., op. cit., p. 351.

to be lost altogether as time progressed.¹ With no strong religious hierarchy to impose a unified interpretation on the distinctive code of Israelite life, the Torah became more of a decisive force within the nation, breeding sects and parties as a result. Since sin came to be conceived as the transgression of the Law, responsibility became dissociated from the community to a large extent and attached to the individual.²

On the other side of the ledger, we have seen that there were circumstantial factors which emphatically established the unity of Israel as a theological actuality. Anti-semitism in its original form was indulged by Antiochus of Syria as well as Hellenistic Egyptian conquerors. This intolerance was interpreted by Jews as a frontal attack on their religious loyalty. Coupled with these outward factors, came the absorbing conviction of Jewish thinkers that the unit Israel was the last bulwark of the true knowledge of God. The Rabbis sought to imbue an urgency into the Covenant People to fulfil its mission. Consequently the Torah (the only true guide to the worship and knowledge of God) and Israel (the locus of God's reign on earth), became fundamental conceptions in the Jewish mind.³ Thus, the unity of God, His singular purpose in choosing Israel, and His identification with the nation, became integral elements in the solidarity of Israel. The People of God were characterized as a "religious commonwealth," at once state and church where no secular notion could exist and

¹The kingship, under divine appointment (a concept so basic to the Old Testament) was scarcely exemplified in the self-designated puppet regimes of post-exilic Jewish history.

²See "Sin" in Bible Key Words, (T.W.N.T.), op. cit., pp. 40f.

³The organic complex of thought which enabled the Jew to live in a spiritual unity of thought and action within the unit Israel, has been examined by M. Kadushin. He concludes that the group mind of the Jewish people was no disembodied ghost. Unity of thought and action was possible because the inevitable and unique configuration of values possessed by every individual was but an original configuration of the organic complex of concepts common to all. Organic Thinking, op. cit., p. 211. Cf. The Rabbinic Mind, op. cit., p. 77.

the love of God was integral with the love of an Israelite neighbor.¹

Eschatological speculation, although forbidden by the Rabbis, was effectively stimulated by the syncretism of the period. Correlative to the problems of cosmology and the existential situation, arose the quest for the origins of sin, misery, and universal death.² The question of meaningfulness in human existence led to the postulation of the exogenous conclusion to history itself. Thus eschatology came into its own with its integration in the theological milieu of Jewish religious philosophy. This raised new questions regarding Israel's duty in securing the eschaton. A new emphasis on solidarity of the race in lieu of the original creation became the counterpart of the new unity to be actualized in the new creation of the Messianic Age. In the meantime, the Rabbis in contrast to their natural inclination, urged an increased altruism as the preparation for the new order.

PART II

¹ Cf. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 30.

² This quest was not allowed to destroy individual responsibility. See S. Levy, op. cit., p. 55.

THE PAULINE CONCEPT OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

THE HUMAN BASIS OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

The study of the Old Testament... of the Second Temple... sources of the concept... of Paul... and their relationship...

PART II

But for that event, the rest of his story would not have been... impossible. Saul or Tarsus... of his day. As a matter of fact... road, a re-orientation of thought... returned; there are some... there. 2) Paul... 3) Still another category of... 'eternal life'... the old and the new agree... latter the signs described...

1. Cf. H. B. Hall, 'Pauline Eschatology', in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1911, p. 101.

2. Cf. H. B. Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

CHAPTER III

THE PAULINE CONCEPTION OF THE SOLIDARITY OF THE HUMAN RACE IN ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE OLD TESTAMENT AND EARLY JUDAISM

Introduction

The study of the Old Testament and Jewish thought in the general period of the Second Temple, has been conducted for the purpose of discovering the sources of the conceptions of solidarity which are reflected in the Epistles of Paul. Our present task is the presentation of the Pauline ideas of unity and their relationship to these source materials.

At the outset, we must justify this portion of our investigation by considering the implications of the conversion experience of the Apostle. But for that event, the rest of our study would not only be unnecessary, but impossible. Saul of Tarsus might have been another of the illustrious Rabbis of his day.¹ As a matter of fact, because of his experience of the Damascus Road, a re-orientation of thought transpired. 1) Many ideas were completely reversed; these are exemplified in the controversies with Judaizers and elsewhere. 2) Other ideas were incorporated into his system of thought unchanged. 3) Still another category of conceptions was subjected to the principle of "stimulus diffusion". An old idea is given a new orientation or content; the old and the new agree in form only.² Of these three classification, the latter two alone concerns us.

¹Cf. H.F. Rall, According to Paul, New York, 1947, p. 3 n.2; A.C. Headlam, St. Paul and Christianity, London, 1913, pp. 14, 18ff.

²Cf. C.C. McCown, op. cit., p. 121.

Before we proceed to the central object of Part Two, it will be necessary to explain the omission of various Hellenistic systems of thought which have been proposed by an influential wing of scholarship as the background of Paul's conception of human solidarity. We will discuss briefly the most plausible Hellenistic sources and objections to them.

1. Stoicism. - Because there was a Stoic "school" in Tarsus,¹ a presumption is lodged that Paul must have been influenced by this philosophy. But the objections over-rule the evidence. In the Stoic system, man was a part of nature, or more accurately a member.² Man was declared to be mortal by reason of his body, which decayed, but immortal by reason of his *δυσειώδης ἀνθρωπότης* "essential humanity."³ The fundamental unity of the cosmos constituted a living being, an organic unity.⁴ The life which animates the cosmic organism is the true reason (*λόγος ὁρθός*),⁵ or alternatively *τὸ τοῦ κόσμου πνεῦμα* "the spirit of the world."⁶ Reason is the essence of the divine. Since it is the common possession of all men, humanity is the incarnation of God, a portion of the

¹Cf. T.A. Lacey, The One Body and the One Spirit, London, 1925, p. 233; T.R. Glover, Paul of Tarsus, London, 1925, p. 5. One reason theories which emphasize the Hellenistic influence on Paul are suspect is that in Acts 26.4, the Apostle claims to have lived in Jerusalem since his youth. What age he might have been is beyond speculation. Whether he studied in such a school, or how much he might have remembered or accepted is equally beyond valid supposition. The problem has no other solution than the assiduous comparison of the Epistles with Stoicism.

²C.H. Dodd, Man in God's Design, Newcastle, 1952, p. 11; T.A. Lacey, op. cit., p. 233.

³C.H. Dodd, Man in God's Design, op. cit., p. 13.

⁴S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 52. A profitable comparison might relate the more modern non-theistic evolutionary theory of emergence to this ancient philosophical counterpart.

⁵S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 52. Cf. W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, Edinburgh, 1917, pp. 134f.

⁶T.A. Lacey, op. cit., p. 233. Cf. W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 28.

universal pantheism;¹ in Epictetus' memorable phrase the soul is "a fragment of God."² It is this feature of the Greek system which most radically contrasts with the Hebraic fundamental distinction between God and Man.³ The Stoic conception of the immanence of the divine would have been utterly revolting to a Jew.⁴

As a Jewish theist, Paul maintains the impassable gulf between the Creator, Who in self-consciousness is free to will into existence that which is, and man, the creature, as the object of the divine creative will.⁵ The bond of Paul's human solidarity is not divine immanence or a metaphysical unity. It is only through a mediated *κοινωνία* "fellowship", that the one God may be imparted to mankind.⁶ The fundamental opposition between the Pauline

¹Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, London, 1920, p. 139.

²Cf. H.R. Willoughby, Pagan Regeneration, Chicago, 1929, p. 294.

³This is true in spite of the account of the creation of man in Genesis where the life of man originates with the infusion of the breath of God. To the Hebrew mind, this was a confirmation of the proximity of God and absolute human dependence upon Him for continuance. Cf. E. Brunner, Man in Revolt, trans. by O. Wyon, London, 1939, p. 109.

⁴Equally foreign to the Jewish mind is the conception of a common spirit of humanity, a "pan-anthropomism" (cf. C.R. Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Society, op. cit., p. 264; what E.L. Mascall in a different context calls "mediaeval realism" or a non-nominalistic conception of humanity. Christ, the Christian, and the Church, London, 1946, p. 71) in which the individual soul at the conclusion of life is united to a common essence resulting in the loss of the self-consciousness as in Far-Eastern religious philosophy. In brief Pauline anthropology is fundamentally Hebraic, a point which is receiving ever-increasing attention from New Testament scholarship. Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵Cf. L.S. Thornton, The Incarnate Lord, London, 1928, pp. 111f.; T.A. Lacey, op. cit., pp. 62f.; C.H. Dodd, Man in God's Design, op. cit., pp. 14f.

⁶Cf. Wm. Robinson, The Biblical Doctrine of the Church, St. Louis, 1948, pp. 1ff. Says C.H. Dodd with insight, "The ground of this assertion that fellowship is the essential nature of reality - what we would see if only our eyes were open to the spiritual nature of things - is not based on philosophical speculation, but is given to us in revelation, the self-disclosure of God Himself." The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 139. Cf. C.R. Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Society, op. cit., p. 264.

view of man justifies our search for the source-background of his thought in his Hebraic heritage, rather than in Stoicism,¹ Platonism,² or other less important Greek philosophical systems. At the same time, we must observe that Man or humanity are rarely, if ever, the object of discussion in the Bible, as it was popular in the Greek world. There, abstract thought is paramount in contrast to the empirical conclusions of the Jewish mind.³ For this reason great caution must be exercised in the interpretation of the Epistles which bear their normal Hellenistic association.

2. Gnosticism. - Other scholars have sought to trace Pauline dependence on Gnostic mythology, particularly in his doctrine of the organic unity of the

¹At the least such was the conclusion to which Th. Zahn was forced in his examination of the alleged relationship of Epictetus to Christianity. Der Stoiker Epikter und Sein Verhältnis zum Christentum, Erlangen, 1894, summarized by A. Schweitzer in Paul and His Interpreters, trans. W. Montgomery, London, 1912, p. 96. In J.B. Lightfoot's admirable examination of the relationship of Seneca to Paul the identical conclusion is reached. "St. Paul and Seneca," St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, London, 1868, pp. 291ff.

²A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p. 125. For the Platonic conception of man, see C.N. Cochrane, op. cit., p. 79.

This is not to deny that there may be notions and ideas which are held in common by these opposing world-and-life views. An example of this may be illustrated by Plato's "realism of universal concepts" which is the basis in his system for all unity. Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., pp. 50f. In many respects it is paralleled by the Hebraic conception of realistic representation (cf. W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 103). C. Chavasse maintains that there is a fundamental agreement between Paul and Plato in their common ascription of true reality to the unseen. The Bride of Christ, London, 1940, p. 75. Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of St. Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 55. It was by this medium, that the archetypal character of Adam could be posited and the events of original history could be ascribed to his posterity (cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, ed. in E.T. by F.C. Grant, London, p. 434.). To this admission that a parallelism does exist, must be added the recognition that there are positions arrived at by totally different means. For Paul, unity is the result of creation. Its awareness is disclosed through revelation. For the Greek, unity is the expression of Reason and recognized through speculation. Cf. J.B. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 292.

³Cf. C.H. Dodd, Man in God's Design, op. cit., p. 17.

race.¹ But this position raises numerous problems in its attempt to correlate the Gnostic view of sin and redemption^P with Pauline theology. For the former system, evil is not primarily a moral phenomenon but purely natural; it becomes identical with the imperfect, the relative, and the finite.² The dualism presupposed by such an understanding of evil, is far closer to Philo's thought (in which the realm of settled being and the world of becoming had by nature tendencies frequently at variance with the good of the totality³) than it is to Paulinism.⁴ Docetism and dualism of a Hellenistic variety (the evil matter captivating a good spirit) is not only unknown in the Epistles, but it is actively controverted by Paul.⁵ The dualism of Pauline theology is exclusively

¹Notably R. Bultmann; cf. Theology of the New Testament, trans. K. Grobel, Vol. I, London, 1952, pp. 174, 250; and, "New Testament and Mythology", in Kerugma and Myth, ed. H.W. Bartsch, trans. R.H. Fuller, London, 1953, p. 15. L.G. Rylands, The Beginnings of Gnostic Christianity, London, 1940, pp. 210f. The proposition involves the whole problem of the Mandaean myth of the Primal Man. It is our contention, that the influence which is reflected, if any, was mediated through the Apostle's Jewish background. Cf. J.M. Creed, op. cit., pp. 129ff.

²Cf. H.L. Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries, London, 1875. p. 13. In substance this is the general view of sin in Hellenistic philosophy (cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, London, 1919, p. 34.) The passages in I Corinthians 15: 21 and 44-49 suggest a close parallel to this view of evil, but when they are taken in the broader context of Paul's thought, it is evident that the reference to Adam involves the moral Fall although it is not referred to specifically. Cf. W. Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, trans. N. Buchanan, Edinburgh, 1896, Vol.II, 60f.

³Cf. E.R. Goodenough, By Light, Light, New Haven, 1935, p. 394.

⁴Cf. J.M. Creed, op. cit., p. 133; E.R. Goodenough, op. cit., p. 394. See W.D. Davies excellent of the whole issue of dualism in the teaching of Paul, op. cit., pp. 17ff.

⁵Cf. B. Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, trans. D. Eaton, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1882, pp. 339f.; E.H. Wahlstrom, The New Life in Christ, Philadelphia, 1950, pp. 5f.; H.F. Rall, op. cit., p. 28; J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 24; A. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 68. Contrast W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939, pp. 99, 127; O. Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, trans. W. Montgomery, Vol. I, London, 1906, pp. 40ff.

moral, not metaphysical.¹ We shall have occasion to return to this contention in the last chapter where a fuller discussion of the differences of the conception of solidarity in Paul from Gnostic mythology will be presented.

3. The Mystery Religions. - A third source for the Pauline doctrines of redemption and anthropology has been sought in the Hellenistic Mystery Religions. The importance of these Cults in the Roman Empire of the first century in conjunction with the similarity of the Pauline terminology, has given the case considerable plausibility in the minds of notable sponsors such as R. Reitzenstein,² W. Bousset,³ K. Lake,⁴ among a number.

The similarities have been well summarized by H.A.A. Kennedy:

Like the Mystery religions, he proclaimed a great 'redemption'. Like them he could point to a 'knowledge' of God which meant not intellectual apprehension but practical fellowship. Like them he could think of a transformation into the Divine likeness which was the very goal of being ... But his presuppositions were different. Redemption from sin was primary with him, not redemption from fate.⁵

There are other reasons for denying any essential relationship between Christianity according to Paul and the Mysteries. W.D. Davies has suggested some of the most fundamental divergencies.⁶ 1) The Mysteries were individualistic while

¹J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, London, 1938, p. 104. Cf. J.A.T. Robinson op. cit., pp. 24ff.; R. Buttmann, "New Testament and Mythology", op. cit., p. 17.

²Cf. e.g. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, (3 Aufl.) Leipzig, Berlin, 1927; Poimandres, Leipzig, 1904.

³Cf. e.g. Kurios Christos, 2nd ed. Göttingen, 1921.

⁴Cf. e.g. The Earlier Epistles of Paul, op. cit., p. 215.

⁵The Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 25. Bousset thinks that there is at least an echo of the liberation from fate in Paul's description of pre-Christian humanity under the bondage of the $\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha$. Kurios Christos, op. cit., p. 195.

⁶Op. cit., pp. 89ff. W.L. Knox agrees in general with this conclusion in St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, Cambridge, 1925, p. 147.

Christianity is social - incorporation into a Community, the Body of Christ.¹

2) The Hellenistic religious experience depended on mythological creations and speculative reconstruction; Christianity was founded on recent historical events and persons witnessed to by individuals then alive. 3) There is no mystical absorption in Christianity. 4) There is no counterpart to faith (in the Pauline sense) in the Mystery religions. 5) The whole atmosphere is radically different.

As in other areas of thought and experience, the clue to a proper understanding of the relationship between Paul and alien religious ideas, is found in "stimulus diffusion". In the Apostle's search for a meaningful terminology, he was obliged to adopt terms with which his audience was acquainted; but, he gave new meanings to them in the new context of Christianity.² In Paul, mysticism is always subordinate to monotheism.³ The human plight is not immersion in an irresponsible *ἐιμαρμένη*, but a moral solidarity in sin. Redemption is not mystical absorption into an esoteric and consequently irresponsible Mystery; justification is cast in ethical terms of holiness and absolute moral purity (cf. Eph. 5:27; 4:17-5:16).⁴

The procedure to be followed in this chapter is the presentation of the bases of Paul's view of human solidarity and the implications which are derived from it in the Epistles. Of primary importance in the first section are both the unity of God and the origin of mankind from one ancestor. The second part of the chapter will examine the representative character of Adam and the corporate

¹C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., p. 22.

²Cf. C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., pp. 127ff.; C. Chavasse, op. cit., p. 19.

³H.F. Rall, op. cit., p. 79.

⁴Contrast W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, op. cit., p. 107.

personality of the race in Adam. The implications of the corporate judgment of Adam and racial involvement in the Old Aeon will be treated in that context as a preparation for the discussion of the last chapter and the conception of the solidarity of the redeemed and re-created humanity.

The Foundations of the Solidarity of the Race

Creation by the One God

The unity of all mankind is a presupposition transferred without challenge from Judaism and the Old Testament into the theology of the Epistles of Paul. The conception is of such a fundamental nature that one searches almost in vain for explicit declarations of the proposition. While there is no argument for what W. Wrede calls "an undefineable coherence between the race and the individual",¹ the assumed unity of the race is the only possible explanation in Paul's mind for the universality of sin and all the determining factors in human existence apart from the obvious inter-relationship of cause and effect (e.g. environmental or personal influence, etc.). This presupposition was not held by Paul in isolation or super-imposed by him upon the contemporary scene, but it was a solidarity which he perceived to be rooted in the original creation of man.

1. The Implications of the Unity of God. - The threshold of Paul's doctrine of the unity of mankind, is the unity of God or his Jewish monotheism.² Without recourse to the pantheism of current pagan cults and philosophy, the Apostle's doctrine adheres to the unity of the Creator as the cause and ground for the unity of the race. It was impossible for him to conceive of men as the atomistic

¹Paul, trans. E. Lummis, London, 1907, p. 82.

²On the unity of God, see S. Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 57. The explicit phrase *εἰς θεός* is found in Rom. 3:30, I Cor. 8:4,6, Gal. 3:20, I Tim. 2:5. It is the direct antithesis to the pantheon "who are called gods" (I Cor. 8:5).

offspring or creations of sundry deities. Individual men are the branches of a human tree growing in its historical dimension from a single seed. It was God Who had created and planted that seed which makes of men an organic unity. A. Steirman says pointedly, "Der Einheit Gottes entspricht die Einheit des Menschengeschlechts."¹

The most explicit reference to human unity in its derivation from the Creator, is made in the Mars Hill address. Paul declares that humanity as a whole is the offspring (γένος) or God (Acts 17:28f.)² implying a common unity akin to the Jewish conception of the corporate sonship of Israel. Although it is impossible to determine any direct relationship between the two ideas, the under-lying conception is the same. Both predicate a corporate divine sonship³ to a group without denying the creation of that group in history (cf. Col. 1:16f. with Deut. 32:6,18).⁴ The intention of Paul in using this terminology was two-fold. On the one hand, it implies the unity of the race⁵ (a

¹Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments, Vol. II, Berlin, 1912. p. 152.

²This passage is a quotation from Aratus, a Stoic of Cilicia. Cf. T.A. Lacey, op. cit., p. 233. This manner of speaking is an apt illustration of the principle of "stimulus diffusion". There is no more of a confusion of the human and the divine in this passage than elsewhere. God is the Creator (vs. 26) not "Infuser". This point applies with equal force to the alleged Stoic formula found in Rom. 11:36, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα (so also with variations, I Cor. 8:6. Cf. Eph. 4:6, Col. 1:16). E. Norden has established the currency of this formula in the early centuries of the era. See Agnostos Theos, Leipzig, Berlin, 1913, pp. 240ff., 374. But Schweitzer has incisively pointed out that although the Apostle claims that all things are from, through, and unto God, he could never assert that all things are in God. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, op. cit., p. 11. Cf. E.C. Rust, op. cit., pp. 207, 212; T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge, 1931, p. 91; A. Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, op. cit., pp. 96, 239.

³L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, London, 2nd ed., 1944, p. 115 n.1.

⁴Cf. E. Brunner, op. cit., pp. 108ff.; G.S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, London, 1947, p. 44.

⁵S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 103.

point made more explicit in the context as we shall see infra); on the other, a common responsibility incurred through the total family relationship to the Creator. In a less defined form, this same idea is found in Ephesians 3:15. Referring to God as the Father in the preceding verse, Paul continues, "From whom every family in heaven and on earth is named ..." The term Father in the same context, and the Hebraic connotation of the term, "name", suggests the idea of a family possessed by God and its consequent responsibility. The reference to the Fatherhood of God is not clear in Ephesians (4:6, "... One God and Father of us all, who is above all and through and in all.") as to its scope. Whether it is restricted to the Church or not, however, all of these passages seek to establish the unity of the corporate son or family while they declare the united responsibility of the race to God.

It is the relationship of man to God which finds fundamental application in Paul's conception of righteousness. Neither sin nor perfection can be judged by a human standard. There is not one righteous among men (Cf. Acts 17:30, Rom. 3:19,23, 5:12),¹ reference is made to the corporate and individual failure of man to fulfil the requirements of the divine standard.²

The basis for Paul's doctrine of responsibility is man's creation by one holy and personal God. The nature of human responsibility is dual; there is the duty toward God and a concomitant duty toward fellowmen. The two areas of responsibility inter-penetrate each other in such a way, that they are not always distinguishable. Paul felt no obligation to argue for this point on the basis of man created in the Imago Dei. In the existence of the law and man's rationality, the dual responsibility of the race is self-evident.

¹For the attestation of an identical view in the Old Testament, see Quell, "Sin", Bible Key Words, (T.W.N.T.) pp. 17ff.

²Cf. E.H. Wahlstrom, op. cit., pp. xi, 7.

Mankind is universally faced with the responsibility of maintaining a moral standard which is his through creation by God.¹ The revelation of this standard to man was made in two distinct ways.

1. The Special Revelation. - Paul teaches that it is the former Jewish law which embodies the revealed will of God for His creatures (Rom. 2:18). It provided the guage by which man must be judged (Rom. 2:12, Gal. 3:10).² The Jews, however, despite their boasting the privileged role as bearers of God's standard (Rom. 3:2) and doers of His will (Rom. 2:17), had fallen far short^{of} its requirements. In brief, they had done the same things for which they had condemned Gentile sinners outside the law (Rom. 2:1, 18ff.). The conclusion of the argument is the corporate guilt of Israel and its consequent condemnation before God (Rom. 3:9).

2. The Natural Revelation. - The objection might have been raised that the law could only determine the responsibility of those to whom it was accessible. This problem was recognized by Paul. In his estimation, it provided the primary distinction between the Jew and the Gentile. Yet, the Gentile was not without law of some kind. This conclusion was confirmed in the Apostle's mind by the fact that non-Jews in some cases fulfilled the basic principles of the law. It was written on the heart, witnessed to by the *συνείδησις* (conscience), and provided the basis for the comparative judging of one man by another (Rom. 2:14f.).³

¹Cf. I Cor. 11:14, " ... ἡ φύσις αὐτὴ διδάσκει..." See R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, op. cit., p. 250.

²For the Jewish conception of sin, see "Sin", Bible Key Words, op. cit., p. 39. Cf. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, trans. L.P. Smith, E. Huntress, London, 1935, pp. 66ff.

³Cf. F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. II, 50. The idea originated in Stoicism, but was evidently adopted by Judaism and given a covenantal basis.

Roughly equivalent to the conscience is the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. This term used to designate that element in man which knows the good and apparently would accomplish it, were it accorded the sufficient power (cf. Rom. 7:22f., 25).¹ But both conscience and mind may be defiled, cancelling any good which they might otherwise instigate (see Tit. 1:15; cf. 3:11). It is quite possible that this innate element opposed to $\tau\omicron\ \varphi\rho\acute{o}\nu\eta\mu\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ represents the Rabbinic yetzer hatob.² But the mind, unaided, is strictly limited in its ability to understand and respond to the wisdom of God.³ But even as the Jews have fallen short of their duty in observing the revealed law, the Gentiles have violated the innate law written on the heart. "The fearful vices which beset the Gentile world are due to the rejection of $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \varphi\upsilon\sigma\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\nu\ \chi\rho\eta\sigma\iota\upsilon\varsigma$ for $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \varphi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \chi\rho\eta\sigma\iota\upsilon\varsigma$ (Rom. 1:26).⁴ This natural law, apprehensible to the "mind", is undoubtedly equivalent to the Jewish Rabbinical preceptive code known as the Noachian commandments. This name denotes their universality in lieu of humanity's common descent from Noah.⁵ These precepts, given to Adam under similar

¹Cf. B. Weiss, op. cit., Vol. I, 348.

²The differences and similarities between the Pauline $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ and the yetzer hatob suggest another instance of stimulus diffusion.

Paul's reflections on the struggle between the mind and the impulses of the body (Rom. 7:23) is Hellenistic in G.F. Moore's opinion (cf. Judaism, op. cit., Vol. I, 486). Cf. F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. II, 49; C.G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, London, 1914, p. 79. Contrast with the Pauline conception that of Philo in which it is "mind" as the image of God which is the source of universal human kinship and the Gnostic Hermetic idea. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, op. cit., p. 175. Cf. C.H. Dodd, Man In God's Design, op. cit., p. 14.

³Cf. F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. II, 50f. This is a point of contrast between Paul and the Hellenistic conception of the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$.

⁴W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 116. This writer admits the Hellenistic form of the argument, but maintains its Jewish essence in the proposition of a universal responsibility of mankind to God. Ibid., pp. 114ff., 327.

⁵Cf. Ibid., p. 114. In both the Midrash and the Talmud, reference is made to the six commandments which were given to Adam: 1) not to worship idols, 2) not to blaspheme the name of God, 3) to establish courts of justice, 4) not to kill, 5) not to commit adultery, 6) not to rob. There was a seventh commandment

circumstances to the revelation of the Torah in Israel, were indelibly inscribed in the hearts of all Adam's descendants. It is described by Paul as the revelation to all men from the foundation of the world, the "truth held in unrighteousness" (Rom. 1:18ff.). It further serves as the basis of man's inexcusability (Rom. 1:20) and universal guilt apart from the question of the possession of the Mosaic Torah (a more external and expanded form of the innate law, Rom. 2:12).¹

It is of supreme importance to recognize at this juncture that any conception of an inherent or universal law can be predicated only on the basis of the solidarity of the race. If a Stoic or Hellenistic conception of the cosmic spirit is rejected on the grounds of Paul's doctrine of creation as the source of the common unity of the race, we are left with no alternative to the Hebraic postulation of the unity of the race through creation and heredity. The corollary of this conviction in both Judaism and Paul's mind, is the corporate responsibility of the race to God in a vertical dimension and to one another on a horizontal level.²

Although Paul postulated the conception of a racial solidarity, it does not imply that a common unity amongst men could be found in his day. The universal kinship of mankind should have found its expression in a universal koinonia; but, with the severance of the covenantal bond of unity with God (Rom. 1:18ff.) came an inevitable dissolution of the external bond of love which

given after the flood which places an injunction on flesh cut from a living animal being used for food (cf. Gen. 9:4). See Sanh. 56a-b. Cf. K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, op. cit., pp. 55ff. Note that these commandments are reflected in the precepts given to Gentile converts and endorsed by Paul in Acts 15:28ff.

¹Note that there is a universal recognition of the good implied in Rom. 12:17b, "... Provide these things honest in the sight of all men." Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 327. It is the basis of the argument in Rom. 13:1ff.

²Although there is no direct reference to a covenantal basis for the solidarity of mankind corresponding to the covenantal unity of Israel, it may have been in the back of Paul's mind. In the Jewish mind, covenants implied responsibility embodied in the mizwoth of the revelation. In this format, the Gentiles would be bound by a covenant with God through Adam, and the innate law would be the mizmoth of that covenant.

should have united all men.¹ The incursion of sin (i.e. failure in responsibility to God) brought strife and factions into the human scene. For this reason, Paul condemned the Christians of Corinth for walking as (κατά) men in their tolerance of schismatic splinters within the group (I Cor. 3:3. Cf. vs. 4, οὐκ ἄνθρωποι ἐστέ;).

The disunity of the ancient world was a characteristic phenomenon, even as it is of our own. The political unity imposed by the force of Roman imperial authority was only external and superficial. Disunity lay imbedded in the seething rebellion of the heart, particularly poignant to a Jew,² who was inclined to think of himself not a little higher than an unclean Gentile. This disunity was fundamental in Paul's estimation. Although one by creation, sin had severed the external bond of solidarity uniting the true Israelite and the Gentile, making him a "stranger from the covenants of promise", and an "alien from the commonwealth of Israel" (Eph. 2:12).³ Paul saw a cosmic significance in the redemption of Christ for the original intention of God, the abolition of the breach between the Godless (ἄθεοι) Gentiles and the privileged Jews was being healed. Unity was being restored in the re-creation of the New Humanity in Christ (Eph. 2:13ff.).

2. The Implications of Common Descent from One Man. - The clearest declaration of the means by which the solidarity of the race is secured, is not found in

¹Cf. E. Brunner, op. cit., p. 141.

²The stock Jewish phrase, "Esau, the wicked", to denote the Roman Empire illustrates the point well. Cf. R.T. Herford, op. cit., p. 211. Disunity in society and religion (cf. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life ..., op. cit., p. 10) were of such a commonplace character, that little sympathy was evoked for the slave, or any ecumenical movements organized to abolish cultic distinctions.

³Cf. J.A. Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1903, pp. 52f.

the Epistles but in Paul's sermon on the Areopagus (Acts 17:22ff.).¹ It was apparently a fundamental feature on his earliest message to a Gentile audience, to emphasize the unity of the race in lieu of its descent from the first man to be created. In any case, we are not left to speculation in Paul's message to the Athenians. In this sermon, Paul establishes the organic unity of the race and a concomitant responsibility of each individual on the basis of the universal human descent from one ancestor.² In the record preserved by Luke, he says, "And (God) has made of one (man)³ every race ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$) of men to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their habitation, that they should seek God ..." (Acts 17:26f.). The implication of the postulate is no less than the universal kinship of all men.⁴ It is the logical expansion and conclusion of the Old Testament conception of the family, in which either, the kin-group immediately, or a whole nation, was designated a בית אב on the basis of common descent. The exclusivism which prevented Judaism from capitalizing on the postulation of a universal brotherhood of mankind was contradicted in the teaching of Jesus to which Paul became heir

toward the other (Rom. 9:17-18. Cf. Gal. 3:12). The expanded application of

¹We are obliged to agree with H. Lietzmann that we are at a loss to do more than attempt an outline of Paul's message to unconverted Gentiles. For this reason, some of the more fundamental elements of his theology may be over-looked altogether. The Epistles assume that their audience is familiar with the essential truths which underlie their theology. Op. cit., p. 113. Cf. also N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 115, K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, op. cit., p. 424.

²Cf. N. Söderblom, The Mystery of the Cross, trans. A.G. Hebert, London, 1933, p. 29; T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, op. cit., pp. 332f.

³The word $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ must be omitted as S. Hanson has well contended and confirmed by the best texts. Op. cit., p. 103. That $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ signifies "one man" is supported by the parallel drawn with Christ in this passage (17:31) and elsewhere (Cf. Rom. 5:18). Cf. M. Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology, op. cit., p. 322.

⁴Cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op. cit., p. 31; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 57f.; B. Weiss, op. cit., Vol. I, 332f.

(cf. e.g. Jn. 10:16, Matt. 5:22, 23f., 47, 7:3ff., 18:15,21,35).¹ Paul specifies the origin of common kinship in descent from one man. This provides the basis for the involved teaching in the Epistles which conceives of Adam as the ancestor and head of the race which is consequently a corporate unit. It is a totality of an identical character to that of Israel in the Old Testament and Early Jewish thought. As Abraham was ascribed the determining role of an ancestor of the nation bearing his name, Adam's character and decisions have implicated his race.² In other words, there is a basis in this postulate for applying the principle of corporate personality to the entire race.

The importance of the Apostle's adoption of the conception of the corporate personality of the kin-group without qualification from the Old Testament is readily seen. Far from being the application of a principle which was endorsed by human psychological and social exigencies, Paul establishes the basis of this solidarity in the eternal counsels of God. Herein is the justification of divine election and predestination. As long as Esau is Edom and vice versa, there is no injustice in the indistinguishable hatred of the one or animosity toward the other (Rom. 9:11-13. Cf. Mal. 1:3f.). The expanded application of the principle of corporate personality has long since been proposed by H.W. Robinson,³ and adopted by C.H. Dodd⁴ and A. Nygren⁵ to explain the problematic

¹This is not to deny that the Rabbis on occasion tried to encourage the concept of common unity. Presumably this unity is rarely grounded in common kinship through generic descent from Adam due to the accepted doctrine of Creationism.

²W. Wrede, op. cit., p. 81, relates Paul's view of Adam to the ancient conception of what happens first in history is repeated in succeeding series or cycles. F.V. Filson, op. cit., p. 11, sees a reflection of the Rabbinic doctrine of merit and demerit. Both are correct in part.

³Cf. The Christian Doctrine of Man, op. cit., p. 121, "Hebrew Psychology", op. cit., p. 378, The Cross of the Servant, op. cit., p. 34.

⁴Cf. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, London, 1932, pp. 79f.

⁵Cf. Commentary on Romans, trans. C.C. Rasmussen, Philadelphia, 1949, p. 213.

Adam-Christ typology. As we proceed, it will become increasingly apparent that the whole of Paul's anthropology and soteriology is built on Hebraic conceptions of the solidarity of the race.

Within the scope of Paul's general conception of the corporate personality of the race in Adam, are two distinctions which, upon their recognition, aid in the understanding of his thought. The first is the role of Adam as the ancestor of the race, involving his historicity as the first man to be created (cf. Acts 17:26, I Cor. 15:45, 47ff.).¹ The second is Adam as the realistic representative of the race, cast in the role of a collective personality (cf. Rom. 5:12ff., I Cor. 15:21f.). The race is identified with Adam and Adam with the race in such a manner, that the experience and consequent judgment of both is mutual.² The collective totality (the many) has both a horizontal and vertical extension, so that all men are "in Adam" (the one, I Cor. 15:22) at any given point in history as well as throughout all history. These two distinctions are not to be treated as though they were mutually exclusive but have been adopted primarily for convenience.

¹Historicity is not only of primary importance out of deference to the Scriptural account, but it is fundamental to a nondualistic explanation of evil. Cf. C.N. Cochrane, op. cit., p. 240; O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 115. There is an appropriate statement in H.L. Martensen's Christian Dogmatics, "Only on the supposition of first parents can evil be regarded as something which was introduced afterwards and which has penetrated through to all". Christian Dogmatics, trans. W. Urwick, Edinburgh, 1895, p. 150. The Fall-theory and dualism are mutually exclusive, as N.P. Williams affirms, op. cit., pp. 148f. Cf. James Orr, Sin as a Problem of Today, New York, n.d., which discusses the problem extensively, especially pp. 137ff. To suppose that Adam's historical existence is an arbitrary assumption in theology, as a number of recent theologians do (cf. e.g. D. Somerville, St. Paul's Conception of Christ, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 97; E. Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, (Dogmatics II), trans. O. Wyon, London, 1952, p. 195), emphasizes the lack of continuity between Early Jewish thought, and recent theological reconstruction. See O. Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, op. cit., p. 289 n.1.

²This distinction corresponds in general to G.B. Steven's phrase "mystical realism". According to this interpreter, Paul conceives of religious truth under

The Fatherhood of Adam and the Terrestrial Character of his Progeny

On the basis of our presupposition that Paul accepted the historicity of Adam,¹ it will be necessary to examine briefly the account of the creation of man in the Old Testament. The Genesis narrative establishes the formation of Adam from the dust (אֲדָמָה) of the earth (Gen. 2:7), creation in the image and likeness of God² (1:27, 5:1), his animation by living breath (2:7), his naming in conjunction with Eve as אָדָם "man" (Gen. 5:2), his unique position in the creation as lord (1:26; cf. 2:15, 19f.), his unique role as the progenitor of the race (1:28, cf. 3:20). By combining the nature of Adam through creation and the nature of humanity as it is, Paul concludes that the latter is a derivation from the former. In his estimation, the three basic features of natural humanity have been determined by the solidarity of all mankind with Adam who was the original human creation. The implications of human generic

forms determined by relationships, especially in the cases of Adam and Christ. The element of "mysticism" refers to its inscrutability; "realism", to its actuality in that sinful humanity, for example, is conceived as present and participating in the trespass of Adam. The Pauline Theology, London, 1892, pp. 32ff.

¹The symbolic or typological frame of reference in which Adam is cast is not to be accepted as evidence prejudicial to Adam's historicity (cf. W. Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, trans. N. Buchanan, Edinburgh, 1896, Vol. II, 62), any more than Paul's use of Abraham's two sons in an allegory can be said to suggest their mythological existence. Cf. Gal. 4:21ff.

²We can only note in passing, that Paul ascribes a superior dignity to man over that of woman on the basis of Adam's creation in the Imago Dei. As in Judaism, a vertical solidarity of the sexes extends back to the original creation of man (I Cor. 11:7) which guarantees the continuity of the male and female status. The position of woman in lieu of her creation (I Cor. 11:9), is one of subjection; hence, the wife must show deference to the husband (Eph. 5:24, Col. 3:18, I Tim. 2:11f.). This latter passage further suggests that a woman's susceptibility to error through deception is a female characteristic which stems from the character of Eve. Paul in no sense traces the origin of sin to Eve's pollution as e.g. Enoch (Secrets, 31:6) does, but merely to woman's gullibility. Cf. N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 57.

relationship to Adam¹ are distinguished from Adam's realistic representative role.²

1. The Perishable Body. - The first implication which we shall consider is corruptibility of the human body. In the words of Paul:

The first man was from the earth (γῆς; cf. גֶּזֶל Gen. 2:7), a man of dust (χρῖνος) ... As was the (man) of dust, so are those who are of dust (οἱ χρῖνοι) ... Just as we have borne the image (εἰκόνα) of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven. I tell you this, brethren: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable (I Cor. 15:47-50; Cf. Rom. 1:23).

In this passage, the Apostle compared the body of the first man with that of all men. He recognizes the incontrovertible fact that human flesh is subject to the laws of natural decay.³ Thus, the mortality of the flesh is one of its

¹It is altogether possible that Paul thought of a correlative relationship between Adam and the race through their sharing a common name (אָדָם - generic man). While he could not make use of the Hebrew identity of name in writing to a Greek-speaking audience, in his own Jewish background the importance of a common name is considerable. The legitimate inheritance of a name meant, as in the Old Testament period, the inheritance of a character (cf. but one of many examples in Wisdom 14.21 which refers to the danger of idols invested with the incommunicable name. For Rabbinic views, see Z.H. Chajes, The Students Guide through the Talmud, London, 1952, p. 176.). In the New Testament, a name is far more than a title. Christ is given a position above every name which is named (Eph. 1:21, Phil. 2:9f.). In such passages as Acts 4:12, 26:9, Matt. 1:21, Eph. 3:15, the name of Jesus Christ is identified with His person. Cf. R. Bultmann, The Theology of the New Testament, op. cit., p. 138. On the human level, to change the name of Peter, is to change the nature of his character (John 1:42). If sins are not named, they are not committed (Eph. 3:5). The importance of this conception is increased with the realization that baptism is εἰς "into" the name of Christ, out of Adam - from the old humanity into the New.

²The failure to recognize these distinctions results in the interpretation of such scholars as P. Wernle, The Beginnings of Christianity, trans. G.A. Bienemann, London, 1903, pp. 233ff. or M. Goguel, op. cit., p. 248 n.2, which involves Paul in a contradiction in his postulation of Adam barred from the Kingdom because he is terrestrial and Adam as a sinner, and therefore condemned to die.

³Cf. W. Beyschlag, op. cit., p. 57.

essential characteristics (I Cor. 15:44,50; cf. II Cor. 4:11,16, 5:1, Rom. 6:12). Man in a part of the changeable physical order.¹ His finitude is equivalent to the Old Testament description of man as grass (cf. e.g. Ps. 103:15).² This was common knowledge to both Paul and the troubled Corinthian Christians. It is the Apostle's vehement argument that there is a logical necessity for the resurrection because the perishable nature of man's body cannot exist in the New Order; rather, the body must be re-created after the pattern of Christ's glorious body (vs. 49; cf. II Cor. 5:1).

It is more than incidental to his argument that there is no definite allusion to the relationship of mankind to Adam through natural descent, for it would have destroyed the parallel between Adam and Christ and their respective communities. It is apparent in the context that the medium of actualization of the old creation is the natural process of birth,³ while the New Humanity is created through a supernatural process of inclusion into Christ (II Cor. 5:17).⁴

¹Cf. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, I.C.C., Edinburgh, 1911, pp. 370,373.

²Cf. H.A. Rall, op. cit., p. 26. W.L. Knox, quite unnecessarily, sees in Paul's doctrine of the corporeality of the body, a reflection of the idea of the fall of a spiritual being into the sphere of matter, which in turn implicates the rest of humanity. It is evidenced in man's possession of a mere living soul, rather than a pure spirit (St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, op. cit., pp. 98f., 127). But Paul does not attach human corporeality to Adam's Fall; it is a consequence of his creation (cf. B. Weiss, op. cit., I,336).

³That is, the organic principle of biological reproduction which requires that that which is born be of the same kind as the parent (cf. Gen. 1:11f, 21, 24, Matt. 7:16-18, Gal. 6:7f.).

⁴As point of clarification, it is necessary to note that Paul views the natural condition of humanity under two aspects. 1) Adam was created mortal, but given the prospect of immortality (cf. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. iv.38.3 [The Treatise of Irenaeus of Lugdunum Against the Heresies, trans. F.R.M. Hitchcock, London, 1916, Vol. II,81], and Clement of Alex., Strom. vi.12.96, where the Church Fathers view Adam as ἀτελής "imperfect", at creation. This point is applicable also to the death of Jesus. It was because He had a

2. The Psychic Body. - In this same passage, Paul describes the natural body as $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ "soulish". "If there is a 'soulish' body, there is also a spiritual body. So also it is written, the first man, Adam became a living soul" (I Cor. 15:44f.).¹ This is an extension of the comparison between humanity and Adam. Not only is the human body corporeal, but the life principle which animates it, derives its finite character from the original $\kappa\acute{o}\mu\eta$ of Adam. All men partake of this creative life principle which stands over against the new life principle of the New Creation ($\tau\acute{o}$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$), which is not temporal but eternal (I Cor. 15:45f.). Again, the explanation for the common possession of a "soulish" body, is the natural process of procreation. "As the same flesh and blood, so also, so to speak, the same soul essence is propagated through the human race."²

3. The Body of Flesh. - The third basic element in Paul's anthropology is mankind as $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$. A considerable amount of confusion has centered around

human body, not because He had sinned that He could die, cf. II Cor. 5:21. In Adam's exclusion from the Garden, and separation from the Tree of Life, the natural course of nature brought death (H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, op. cit., pp. 121f.). But we must avoid the conclusion drawn in a vacuum (cf. B. Weiss, op. cit., p. 336). 2) Rather, it is in actual fact that sin has entered to bring death in its wake (cf. J. Laidlaw, The Bible Doctrine of Man, Edinburgh, 1895, p. 240). Thus, Death, a tyrannical force, has gained dominion over the race, but not through Adam's creation. It is rather the consequence of his Fall as the racial representative (cf. W. Beyschlag, op. cit., pp. 60f. Contrast R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, op. cit., I, 174.).

¹The contrast between Paul and Philo readily seen at this juncture. The latter sets $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$ and $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ in sharp antithesis. Cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 34 n.3.

²B. Weiss, op. cit., p. 338 n.8. The idea is identical with the Old Testament conception of the extension of the ancestor's soul to the kin-group. In the common participation of the same soul, there is the further implication of the inheritance of the character of the ancestor.

conjectures introduced to explain the Apostle's broad and enigmatic use of this term.¹ Burton suggests seven distinctive uses of the term from the reference to the merely physical nature of man's body, all the way to an "element that makes for sin".² For our purposes, a simpler classification suggested by Wahlstrom is quite adequate: 1) the ordinary sense of the material flesh (cf. e.g. Gal. 4:13, I Cor. 15:39); 2) $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ used as the symbol of human existence.³ It is vital for our study to further sub-divide the second category into human nature apart from any connotation of sin, and $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ as a symbol of man's involvement in the Old Aeon (*infra* 219).⁴ In this sub-division, we may note a very distinct echo from the Old Testament conception of $\gamma\psi\tau$.⁵ On the one hand, it defined the kin-group, constituted of one flesh through generic descent. On the other hand, $\gamma\psi\tau$ was used to describe a relationship which could be acquired, such as one might secure through the union of marriage (cf. Gen. 2:24 with Eph. 5:29) which was essentially spiritual in its character. When "flesh" denoted an acquired relationship, it was often given an ethical

¹These conjectures follow two general lines: a) those who interpret the "flesh" as the point of sin's attack, and 2) those who find a basic dualism in Paul's use of the term. Flesh is, like the Hellenistic conception of matter, evil in itself.

²See his discursus in The Epistle to the Galatians, I.C.C., New York, 1920, pp. 492ff.

³E.H. Wahlstrom, The New Life in Christ, Philadelphia, 1950, p. 9.

⁴Cf. P.C. Boylan, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Dublin, 1934, p. 83; F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. II, 402f. C.H. Dodd's classification is excellent: 1) flesh as a purely physical (or meta physical) term ... morally indifferent, and 2) as a psychological and ethical term signifying the sum of the instincts wrongly directed. Romans, op. cit., p. 120.

⁵See J.A.T. Robinson's whole discussion in The Body, London 1952, pp. 11ff. and C.A. Wood, St. Paul's Conception of the Humanity of Jesus Christ, unpublished Ph. D. thesis, New College, Edinburgh University, 1954, pp. 147ff. It is of some significance that the LXX translates $\gamma\psi\tau$ as $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (cf. E. Burton, op. cit., p. 492).

connotation. Thus, it was "flesh" which corrupted itself (cf. Gen. 6:12) in all the earth.

Corresponding to the distinctions in the Old Testament, *σαρξ* is used by Paul to refer to a purely racial or physical symbol (cf. Col. 2:5 [note I Cor. 5:3], Gal. 4:14 [note I Cor. 6:13]); but, by acquisition, in the context of the Old Age, the "flesh", has a very definite ethical connotation.¹ We shall discuss this latter usage under the implications of the corporate judgment of Adam. It is our present interest to see the implications of heredity for Adam's kin-group.

1. **Flesh Denoting Kinship.** - In the narrow confines of the national community, Paul and Israelites are "kinsmen according to the flesh" (Rom. 9:3; cf. Rom. 4:1, I Cor. 10:18); Christ is a Jew or a Son of David, according to the flesh (Rom. 9:5, 1:3). Philemon 16, is not clear. Onesimus is Philemon's brother "in the flesh", either through their common nationality or through the universal kinship of all men. In this broader context, "flesh" or "flesh and blood", may denote humanity as a whole or in part (cf. I Cor. 15:50, Gal. 1:16, Rom. 9:8); while, "no flesh", means simply no man (Rom. 3:20, Gal. 2:16,

¹The usage of *σαρξ*, in the Epistles, is distributed in a proportion of 56 cases of the former, and 35 of the latter. H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, op. cit., p. 114; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 19. At the same time, we do not wish to register a disagreement with E.H. Wahlstrom's classification (supra). It is quite adequate to cover Paul's usage, except possibly in Rom. 8:12, 13:14, and Gal. 5:13, where *κατὰ σάρκα* denotes a force (cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 22). Maybe the best example of this contrast in one passage is to be found in II Corinthians 10:2f., "... Which reckon us as, if we walked according (*κατὰ*) to the flesh, for though we walk in (*ἐν*) the flesh, we do not fight according (*κατὰ*) to the flesh". It is the same distinction which John draws between "being in the world" and "being of the world". The phrase "in the likeness (*ὁμοιώματι*) of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), was used by Paul to preserve this distinction (cf. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life ..., op. cit., p. 129; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 19).

I Cor. 1:29, Eph. 6:12). It follows from this usage that to live "in the flesh", may imply no more than continued existence in this earthly life (Phil. 1:22,24, Gal. 2:20).¹

2. Flesh as Weak and Susceptible to External Influence. - Beyond Paul's use of *σὰρξ* to denote human relationship, one encounters the term with the connotation of weakness. For this reason (i.e. "the infirmity of the flesh") the Apostle speaks to the Roman Christians as men (6:19, cf. Gal. 4:13f.). The flesh of man is perishable (I Cor. 15:39f.), subject to fatigue (II Cor. 12:7) and space restriction (Col. 2:5). Such a conception of "flesh" is familiar from the Old Testament teaching.² But this weakness is more than mere powerlessness. It implies human susceptibility to external influence and illicit desires. Such a character makes the "flesh" a prey to the powerful influence of sin and evil forces (cf. Eph. 6:12; II Cor. 10:3) concluding in Paul's doctrine of the slavery of the flesh to sin.³ It is the symbol of man's inability to please God or to understand His purposes (Rom. 8:8, II Cor. 1:12, I Cor. 1:26, 2:5,13). In the last analysis, the flesh is not evil in itself, but the product of natural generation.⁴ It is the symbol of man as the creature over against God as the Creator to Whom he is responsible.

¹L.S. Thornton, The Common Life ..., op. cit., p. 153; J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 21. We may note in passage, that *σῶμα* like *σὰρξ* is used to refer to man in the world (cf. II Cor. 12:2f., 5:3-10). Like flesh also, it is that which joins all people rather than what a Greek would consider a designation of individuation (cf. ibid., p. 29).

²See supra 67f. Cf. also J. Weiss, op. cit., pp. 605f.; J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 19; C.A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 148f.

³Cf. H.F. Rall, op. cit., p. 30; C.H. Dodd, Romans, op. cit., p. 120.

⁴Cf. E. Burton, op. cit., p. 493; J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 24; for a careful discussion on the whole problem of dualism see, W.P. Dickson, St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit, Glasgow, 1883, passim.

Conclusion. - We have sought in this section, to present the implications which natural descent had for the human race as the progeny of Adam. The three terms, body, soul, and flesh, are variously used by the Apostle to describe the creaturely finitude of mankind. We have also contended that the universality of these characteristics is an evidence of the Old Testament conception of the family, in which the succeeding generations share in the $\gamma\psi\bar{\iota}$ ^{of} the ancestor. There is more. As in the Old Testament, flesh is a totality denomination which is descriptive of the solidarity of the group; so in Paul, "...σάρξ stands for man, in the solidarity of creation in his distance from God, (and) σῶμα stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, as made for God."¹ Such an idea of a universal totality comes primarily from the Old Testament period of Hebrew thought.

There may be some intimations of a Rabbinic doctrine of the creation of the race in Adam. As the summary of Davies shows, there was a type of mythological unity of the race mediated through its origin:

That doctrine implied that the very constitution of the physical body of Adam and the method of its formation was symbolic of the real oneness of mankind. In that one body of Adam, east and west, north and south were brought together, male and female, as we have seen. The 'body' of Adam included all mankind.²

We noted in chapter two, that the Jewish doctrine of human reproduction maintained that the physical and natural body was the heritage from the parents. The soul was infused directly by God. If we are restricted in this particular section to treating the natural inherited characteristics of the race, it would be correct to see a coincidence between the Old Testament and Judaism as the background. On the other hand, Paul's emphasis on the universal kinship of all men, savors more of the ancient conception of the race as the extension of the flesh or the

¹J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 31.

²W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 57.

soul of the ancestor.¹

Adam's Realistic Representation of the Race

The Corporate Transgression

The detailed study of the conception of corporate personality in the Old Testament, indicated that realistic representation of a group might devolve on the head of that group. It might in one case be the father, in others, a master, priest, or king. Paul did not choose to emphasize the hereditary relationship in his doctrine of mankind's corporate involvement in sin and death.² His sole purpose in mentioning the relationship of Adam to his progeny is to draw a direct antithetical parallel between Adam with his community, and Christ with the New Humanity.³ If we heed Barth's warning to interpret Adam as merely the type of the real thing, that is, the Christ-collectivity,⁴ we are forced to allow that realistic representation is the primary element in Paul's Adam-typology.

Paul's discussion of Adam's representative role in the introduction of sin is confined in large to two passages:

¹E. Brunner rejects this proposition, asserting that biological unity is of no concern to our existence as human beings; "but we are bound", he continues, "in a quite unique way, in that way which is called mutual responsibility". Man in Revolt, op. cit., p. 140. Apparently, Paul sees at least one major basis for common responsibility in kinship (cf. Rom. 9:3, Philemon 16 with Rom. 1:14, I Cor. 9:22, Eph. 3:1, and Rom. 10:12,14).

²E. Brunner objects strenuously to Augustine's first argument for Original Sin, i.e. a hereditary bias stemming from Adam. Its impossibility is according to Brunner, the grounding of something personal in a natural fact. Man in Revolt, op. cit., pp. 121f., cf. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, op. cit., p. 82.

³Cf. P. Wernle, The Beginnings of Christianity, trans. G.A. Bieneman, London, 1903, Vol. I, 230; A.S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, Manchester, 1916, p. 27; A. Nygren, op. cit., p. 211. H.T. Powell, The Fall of Man, London, 1934, p. 25, lays undue importance on the factor of Rabbinic speculation.

⁴K. Barth, Christus und Adam nach Röm. 5, Zurich, 1952, p. 11. Cf. E.J. Bicknell, op. cit., p. 22; K. Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, trans. E. Hoskyns, London, 1933, pp. 170f.

1) Romans 5:12-16; 19-21:

Wherefore, as by (διὰ) one man sin entered into the world (κοσμόν), and by (διὰ) the sin death, so also death came (διήλθεν) upon (εἰς) all men, because (ἐφ' ᾧ)¹ all men have sinned.² For until the law, sin was in the world, but sin is not charged (ἐλλογείται)³ if there is no law.⁴ But death reigned from Adam until Moses, even upon those who did not commit the same kind of sin as Adam's transgression (παράβασις), who is a type of the One (who was) to come. But unlike the transgression (παράπτωμα) is the gracious gift (χάρισμα). For if by the transgression of the one, the many perished (ἀπέθανον), in how much greater measure on the other hand did the grace of God and the gift of grace abound to the many by the one man, Jesus Christ. And it is not (the same) with the gift as it was through the one who sinned, for the judgment (κρίμα) (was) of (ἐξ) one (man or sin) to condemnation; but the gracious gift is from the many offences to (εἰς) justification ... For as through (διὰ) the disobedience of the one man the many were given rank as (κατεστάθησαν) sinners, so also through the obedience of one (man) the many shall be given the rank (κατασταθήσονται) of righteous. But the law entered in order to aggravate the transgression; but where sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) was aggravated (ἐπλεόνασεν) grace super-abounded, in order that as sin reigned in (ἐν) death, so also grace reigned through justification unto (εἰς) eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.⁵

2) In a more contracted passage, the same theme occurs in I Corinthians 15:21f.:

"Wherefore since by (διὰ) (one) man is death, also through (one) man is the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made to live."

The theme of these passages is the relationship of the one to the many. One man (in this case, Adam) sinned. Because of his realistic representation of the

¹Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 133; F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 256, and now almost universally accepted.

²ἡ ἁμαρτία, in the aorist tense, denoting completed action. It is a point in favor of the interpretation of humanity corporately sinning in Adam. See F.R. Tennant, op. cit., p. 257.

³Cf. Romans 4:15.

⁴Sin, in this passage, is comparable to a successful pleader in a law-court. Without the Law (as judge) no verdict of guilty could be given. Cf. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life ..., op. cit., p. 128.

⁵A. Nygren quite correctly sees in this passage, the highpoint of the Epistle, in the light of which the whole is best understood. Commentary of Romans, op. cit., p. 20.

race, his original transgression was not isolated but corporately involved the whole of the race.¹ It is Adam's position as the archetypal head of the race, which he embodies as a corporate personality, that makes his rebellion against God the revolt of his group. Under such a conception (particularly as it is found in the Old Testament), it was quite possible for Paul to see the individual and the group as identical. This identity is evident in such a phrase as, e.g. "in Adam" (cf. I Cor. 15:22), which is the direct converse of the phrase, "in Christ" (see supra 185f.).

But does Paul actually intend that his readers should understand that in Adam's disobedience, all men in some mystical manner participated? This question has both perplexed and divided interpreters down through the history of Pauline exegesis.² If we examine this passage in the light of the principle of corporate personality a two-fold answer is probably justified.

1) Yes, we must in the first analysis admit that Adam's sin was corporate or shared by all men.³ The use of the aorist, ἡμαρτον, is an indication in this direction.⁴ In the words of A. Nygren, "If we are to keep the translation,

¹Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 68; A. Nygren, op. cit., p. 213.

²See discussions by F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. I, 218; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 134, and S. Hanson, for more recent views op. cit., pp. 66ff.

³Cf. F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 261; A.B. Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, New York, 1907, p. 130; H. Weinel, Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen, 1911, p. 245; W. Beyschlag, op. cit., II, 60; W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 32; D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 86, G.B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1899, 357f.; and, O. Pfleiderer's first ed., Paulinism, op. cit., pp. 39ff. Contrast the opinion of Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 134; K. Barth, Romans, op. cit., p. 172; H.C. Sheldon, New Testament Theology, New York, 1911, p. 212; C. Weizsäcker, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, trans. J. Millar, London, 1894, Vol. I, 149f.

⁴Contrast H.C. Sheldon, op. cit., p. 211, who sees a significant escape from this view in the possible use of the aorist with a perfect sense.

'because all have sinned', we shall have to understand it as Augustine did, 'all men have sinned in Adam'.¹ A confirmation of this conclusion is found in Romans 5:19, where a direct antithesis is drawn between the disobedience of Adam and the obedience of Christ. In II Corinthians 5:14, this act is explicitly defined as the corporate death of Christ: "For the love of Christ constrains us, this judging, that one died for all; then indeed all died (*ἀπέθανον*, lit. trans.). On the basis of the realistic representation of the heads of the two respective types of humanity, Paul affirms that the two corresponding groups have actually participated in the archetypal acts of human history. Only on such a basis, can any adequate parallel be seen between the original transgression of Adam and the obedience of the Second Adam.²

2) The second aspect of Paul's answer rests on the empirical fact of universal human endorsement of Adam's representative act. The aspect of oscillation in the Hebrew conception of corporate personality comes into view as the focus turns to examine mankind. It is noteworthy that Paul does not even begin his theology of Romans with a reference to the corporate transgression of Adam; on the contrary, it is his conclusion.³ In the interest of establishing the universal involvement of the human race in sin, no mention is made of Adam at all. It is the unfolding of the sordid human story, the increasing corruption within the group and individual relationships through following one's free choice.⁴ Nor was Paul's introduction of Adam as the source of sin, intended

¹Op. cit., pp. 214f.

²Cf. F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 265.

³Cf. H.F. Rall, op. cit., pp. 36f. H. Weinel contrasts the metaphysical (Rom. 5) with the empirical (Rom. 1f.). Op. cit., p. 370. This is the only one of the Epistles which presents a more or less systematic approach to the problems of sin and redemption.

⁴Cf. A.S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, op. cit., pp. 27, 30; F.R. Tennant, The Concept of Sin, op. cit., pp. 40f., J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 607.

in any sense to detract from man's responsibility for sin. It is of the very essence of Paul's argument to maintain the complete inexcusability of man. This individual option is particularly evident in Romans 7. This passage makes every man "the Adam of his own soul" since the powerful influence of sin comes to overcome and deceive man, yet not apart from the self-determinate will of the individual.¹

For Paul, our division of the answer to the original question into two opposing aspects, would savor of a scholastic distinction. As long as the one is the many, and the many are the one, no distinction can be made between the sin of the representative and that of his group.² In itself, the whole issue was less

¹Some scholars point to ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον (Rom. 5:12) as an example of this idea (cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 32), but it is not well substantiated. The same idea is found in II Thess. 2:9ff. where men are deceived by the "lawless man" but at the same time love unrighteousness and hate the truth. Cf. J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 435.

²A similar failure to notice any paradox in an inherent bias to sin, and individual responsibility was noted in 4 Ezra (cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 40; P. Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Leipzig, 1910, p. 272) and 2 Baruch. Even the Rabbis at times reflect this conception. But Paul's teaching on sin is unique in its predication of a corporate sin of the race in Adam. This is nowhere to be found in our Jewish sources.

It is questionable whether R. Bultmann has embraced the whole scope of Paul's thought on this subject, that is, in his use of the Adam-Christ analogy. He maintains that since not all men have received life through Christ, life is only a possibility for those who exercise faith. Adam's sin, by its converse analogical relationship, produces only the possibility of sin and guilt for the race. It becomes a reality only through their own responsible action (cf. Theology of the New Testament, op. cit., p. 252. See also H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, op. cit., p. 119; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 134; H.C. Sheldon, op. cit., p. 212.). The statement is true, but does not go far enough. The background of Paul's idea lies in his doctrine of election and predestination. Christ is realistically identified with the elect, even apart from a necessary individual endorsement as he says in Eph. 1:4, "... he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world" (cf. II Tim. 1:9, Tit. 1:2). Individual choice, in Paul's thought, is the human counterpart to a previously ordained or existent fact (cf. C.H. Dodd, Romans, op. cit., p. 80; G.B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology, op. cit., p. 136).

problematic than the corporate sin of Achan or David would have been, for there is a vindication of God's treatment of Adam's sin as a racial act in the universal human adoption of his way. In the particular conception of solidarity which Paul applies to the whole race, the archetypal action of the representative is indistinguishable from the innumerable acts of members within the human totality.¹ But this is not true only because of the solidarity of mankind. As we have already discovered in the Old Testament and Judaism, sin was itself unconfined to the individual. It was organic, contagious, invariable involving the group in guilt.² Like dye when poured into a body of water colors the whole, so the original pollution has spread from the fountain-head to sully the entire human stream. In this manner, Adam's Fall and the universal guilt and propensity to sin are inseparably bound together.³ Both the unity of the race and the impossibility of maintaining sin's immurement produce the confirmation of Paul's doctrine.

The Corporate Judgment

A further certitude of the truth of his doctrine of the corporate sin of the race was deduced by Paul from the corporate judgment of the race. Since the Apostle held to an unmitigated conception of the justice of God, there assuredly could be no punishment where there was no guilt or sin. On the basis of the fact that sin can be imputed only of the ground of transgression of law (Rom. 5:13, cf. 4:15) and the second consideration that there was no law between Adam

¹Cf. W.P. Dickson, op. cit., p. 318; E. Burton, op. cit., pp. 422f.

²Cf. E. Brunner, The Christian Doctrine on Creation and Redemption, op. cit., p. 96; C.H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 80.

³Cf. "Sin" Bible Key Words (T.W.N.T.), op. cit., p. 78.

and Moses, the universal punishment of the race with death, implies the corporate sin of the race in Adam (vv. 13f.).¹ Since there could be no other sin in existence between the original injunction laid upon Adam and the revelation of the Torah, it was a conclusive argument for Paul that the race had sinned in Adam.² Despite the absence of sin as individual transgression, death reigned over all;³ it was the application of corporate justice on the provocation of a corporate transgression.⁴

As in the conception of the two-fold sin of the one and of the many, Paul did not isolate the punishment of death as the only retribution to follow the original disobedience of Adam. Sin as an active power subverts the innocence of each individual. Its domain is identical in its scope with the sphere of the reign of death. They are inextricably inter-related, in that, the reward of sin is death (Rom. 6:23) and all have sinned (Rom. 3:23).⁵

In the whole of this discussion, we are forced to see the Jewish heritage of Paul. In both the Old Testament and the post-canonical Jewish writings, the conception of a divine corporate justice is frequently encountered. As the group might be punished with or for the sin of a member who represents the

¹Cf. P. Wernle, op. cit., p. 229; W. Beyschlag, op. cit., II, 59; F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 257. Paul affirms the less apparent universality of sin from the undeniable inevitability of death in these verses (cf. F.C. Baur, Paul: His Life and Works, trans. A. Menzies, Vol. II, London, 1875, p. 185; A.B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 129).

²F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. I, 217; Vol. II, 59.

³N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 128; W. Beyschlag, op. cit., II, 55.

⁴This point may be further attested by the death of infants. Cf. W. Beyschlag, op. cit., II, 59; P.C. Boyland, op. cit., p. 83; A.B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 129; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 69.

⁵We have already argued above, that it is non-essential to hold that Paul believed in the natural immortality of Adam prior to the Fall. We may infer that in the dissolution of the body, the laws of nature are allowed to remain unchanged due to sin. Cf. J. Laidlaw, op. cit., pp. 239f.

group realistically, the whole race is involved in the judgment of Adam's archetypal act. It is the expansion of the idea of demerit from its normal restriction to Israel, and a re-application to the human totality. One is further impressed by the organic nature of Paul's thinking. Inseparably related to the proposition of a corporate sin is the individual's free choice of evil. The corporate judgment of God, applied on the basis of the solidarity or corporate personality of the race, is vindicated by the individual's willingly entangling himself in guilt. For these reasons, it is quite unrealistic to maintain stubbornly that Paul is dependent upon specific Jewish documents such as 4 Ezra or 2 Baruch, or even the opinions of certain Rabbis. The principles were right at hand. On the other hand, the uniqueness of the Apostle's thought apparently stems directly from the antithetical deductions of his soteriological doctrine of Christ's realistic representation of the New Humanity.¹

The Solidarity of Humanity in the Old Aeon

Introduction

We have already attempted to establish the contention that Paul applied the Hebraic ideas of kinship and corporate personality to the entire race of men. But this is not a claim that we have exhausted the Apostle's thought on the solidarity of the race. Other passages, as well as those which have been examined, posit the mysterious conception of an Old Aeon or Age (αἰών).² The connotation of the term, involves both the solidarity of the creation and a

¹Note, e.g. Romans 8:10, "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin (i.e. of Adam; cf. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life ..., op. cit., p. 143); but the Spirit is life because of righteousness (i.e. of Christ)".

²Cf. A. Nygren, op. cit., pp. 20ff.

corresponding continuity of humanity under subjection to powerful forces which control all material existence. O. Cullmann has made a noteworthy contribution to a Biblical understanding of the Aeon in his book Christ and Time. He correctly shows, that in the Hebraic conception of man, humanity is not isolated in the Creation. On the contrary, he holds a representative position over all that God has made.¹ In the New Testament, man's exalted role of lordship in the Creation, lies behind the solidarity which is inferred to exist between man and nature (cf. Rom. 8:19ff. See Gen. 3:17ff. and Jewish views supra 99ff.). For this reason, the curse of corporate humanity in Adam, implicates the rest of Creation.²

In man's miserable failure to effect the destiny which was designed by God for him, he is actually allying himself with the nefarious forces of the Old Age in open rebellion against the universal authority of God. United together, it has become the formation of an enemy stronghold within God's universal state. If we were to ask how this all came about, the accusing finger again points to Adam, who was responsible for bringing the race into this alien alliance. As the Apostle does not in stated terms ascribe this initiatory role to Adam, this point is clear only as it can be derived from the Adam-Christ parallel.³

In this parallel, certain facts may be deduced. In the relationship of the redeemed to Christ (who is the Figure under discussion, Adam's antitype), there is no question of a hereditary connection. Rather, it is the One taking the place of the many, including them in Himself (note the re-iteration of this idea

¹Cf. Gen. 1:28, Ps. 8:5ff. for the lordship of Adam and humanity.

²O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op. cit., pp. 101, 115ff. Cf. S.A. Cook, The Cambridge Ancient History, op. cit., p. 443.

³"In the New Testament point of view, is not the essential thing in the figure of Adam the fact that a Second Adam comes after him?" O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 95.

in Rom. 5:8-21, I Cor. 15:19ff., 45ff.). The Community is related to Christ through faith and personal choice in such a manner, that He, as their Representative, does in and for them, what they could not do for themselves (cf. Rom. 5:8). An identically inclusive role is played by Adam, who as the first man is the universal archetype of all men, a sort of comprehensive personality.¹ As Christ implicated the New Humanity in the New Age, Adam has involved his race in the Old.

The Nature of the Old Aeon

The root of the aeon-concept lies buried in the ancient astrological observation of time cycle patterns. The variation in the seasons due to the omitted inclusion of the few hours over 365 days in one year in the primitive calendar, provided the basis for a calculation of the World Year. How it came about that Judaism assumed only two aeons (the postulation of seven is more common) is not easily explained.² It is probable that the aeon-conception was modified by the doctrine of the Fall, the antithesis of Satan and God, and the eschatological expectation of the restoration of Israel. M. Dibelius has established that in the aeon-concept, there was an integration of the astral and the spirit-world. Since a star-spirit rules the world during any stated epoch, there is an apparent alliance between the aeon-theory and the belief in a world-ruler.³

In the Epistles of Paul, the terminology used to denote the Old Aeon is both varied and confusing. For our purposes it will be sufficient to confine our discussion to *αἰών* and *κόσμος*. The term *αἰῶνος τούτου* "this age", (cf. Rom. 12:2, I Cor. 1:20, 2:6,8, 3:18, II Cor. 4:4, Gal. 1:4) or *τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος*

¹Cf. J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 434; S. Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

²Cf. J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 603 n.15; E. Burton, *op. cit.*, pp. 427ff. This writer claims that Paul provides the earliest evidence of the acceptance of this idea among Christians.

³*Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, Göttingen, 1909, pp. 193f.

(Eph. 1:21), or $\delta \nu\upsilon\upsilon \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$ (I Tim. 6:17, II Tim. 4:10, Tit. 2:12), is a total concept which refers to both time and sphere.¹ At the same time, the term $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ may denote the vital relationship between the creation and the age (cf. I Cor. 3:19, 7:31).² J. Weiss says succinctly, "The fundamental conception that this present world will be replaced by a new world, a 'new creation' (I Cor. 5:17, Gal. 6:15), while the former itself 'passes away' (I Cor. 7:31), is the basic apocalyptic pattern of Paul's thinking."³

The $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ and the $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$ have a very definite relationship to spiritual beings.⁴ Paul refers to being made a spectacle ($\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\omicron\nu$) in the cosmos as becoming the gazing-stock of both men and angels (I Cor. 4:9). The formulae $\epsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ κατὰ θανάτων (Phil. 2:10), and $\tau\alpha \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ ἀόρατα (Col. 1:16; cf. vs. 20), show the same corresponding inclusion of the spirit-world and the material creation under the term $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (κτίσις) (cf. Col. 1:15 with vs. 16) which in turn is similar

¹Cf. E.C.E. Owen, " $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$ and $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$," J.T.S., Vol. 37, 1936, pp. 266ff. where he lists a parallel usage in the LXX; e.g. "a generation, race of men" (Sap. 14:6), "this world" (Ps. 89 (90):8, Eccles. 3:11, Eccles. 38:34 (in the sense of the sensible, material, sinful world). There is more than one example of the use of $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$ in the plural (cf. I Cor. 10:11, $\tau\alpha \tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta \tau\omega\nu \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon\nu\omega\nu$; 2:7, Gal. 1:5, Col. 1:26, Eph. 3:9, II Tim. 1:9, Tit. 1:2); but, this usage has a less technical meaning, i.e. successive periods of time, ages.

²Cf. Eph. 2:2 $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\omicron\nu \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon \kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$. The phrase represents a single Hebrew phrase often encountered in the Rabbis. Its usage also bears the connotation of a contrast between the world in this age and the era (along with its effects) which the Messiah will introduce. Cf. J. Armitage Robinson, op. cit., p. 48.

³Op. cit., p. 604.

⁴Cf. W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, Edinburgh, 1917, p. 13. According to J. Weiss, it corresponds to the Stoic conception of the cosmos which includes "gods and men". Op. cit., p. 595 n.2 and references to Epictetus I.9.7; Diogenes Laert. VII.138.

in its connotations to κόσμος.¹

In Paul's use of the problematic phrase στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου there may be the idea of the inter-relation of metaphysical, spiritual, and material elements.² Apparently, this phrase carries a more specific connotation of spirits and demons which are in active opposition to the original intention of the Creation (cf. Gal. 4:3, 9, Col. 2:8, 20). There is in this phrase the suggestion of the spirits which control the heavenly bodies of the universe and determine the succession of seasons and days.³ In Galatians 4:8f., Paul evidently realtes the στοιχεῖα to the heathen deities (which according to I Cor. 10:19f. have a real

¹J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 596. The terms κτίσις and κόσμος by no means always imply a connection with evil (cf. e.g. Col. 1:15). There were, of course, the good angels for both Judaism and Paul, which although part of the universal creation were free from the corruption of sin (cf. I Cor. 15:52, I Thess. 4:16, Gal. 3:19, I Cor. 13:1).

²Cf. E.C. Rust, *op. cit.*, pp. 235f. The connection of the στοιχεῖα with the aeon may be no more than terminological. Burton claims that apparently there is no evidence that στοιχεῖον meant "spirit", "angel", or "demon" earlier than the Test. Sal., which is probably late (cf. E.Y. Hinks, "The Meaning of the phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Gal. 4:3 and Col. 2:8," J.B.L., Vol. 15, p. 191). Burton continues his contention that Paul does not accept the demonic connotation but refers merely to imperfect teaching (cf. *op. cit.*, p. 514f.; so also J.B. Lightfoot, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Colossians and Philemon*, London, 1886, pp. 180f.; F. Prat, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, 422f.). It has been a point of contention down through the history of exegesis (cf. E.Y. Hinks, *op. cit.*, p. 183). W.H.P. Hatch has produced evidence that the Syriac equivalent to στοιχεῖα meant personal powers or elemental spirits in *The Book of the Laws of the Countries*, a work of Philip, a disciple of Bardaisan near the beginning of the third century. In Hatch's opinion the passages in Colossians and Galatians bear the same meaning (cf. "τὰ στοιχεῖα in Paul and Bardaisan," J.T.S., Vol. 28, 1927, pp. 181f.). So also C.H. Dodd, *Romans*, *op. cit.*, p. 185, and M. Dibelius, *op. cit.*, pp. 79ff. Certainly the original Greek sense of the term as material matter, is secondary in Paul's mind. J. Weiss connects the concept of the στοιχεῖα to the contemporary belief in the determinative role of the constellations (so also C.A.A. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 31), while Bousset is convinced that nowhere in the thought-world of Gnosticism and St. Paul, do the two come so closely together as they do in the conception of humanity in bondage to the στοιχεῖα (cf. *Kurios Christos*, *op. cit.*, p. 195). See further, C.A. Wood's discussion, *op. cit.*, pp. 155ff.

³Cf. E.Y. Hinks, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

existence as demons), in that he refers to Christians having formerly been subjected to them.¹ In the opinion of E.Y. Hinks, there is nothing in the Pauline theology which conflicts with his expressed opinion that the elemental forces of the world were spirits.²

In still other passages, one encounters apparent reference to the spirit-rulers who govern the cosmos. In I Corinthians 2:6,8, Paul asserts that the wisdom of God was unknown to the ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, which is now generally conceded to mean angelic or spiritual powers.³ Cullmann maintains that the ἐξουσίαι are spirit-authorities,⁴ but the nature of their loyalty is not always clearly distinguished (cf. I Cor. 15:24). Colossians 2:15 clearly illustrates the relationship of the evil ἐξουσίαι to the aeon. Their authority has been effectively challenged by the death and victory of Christ.⁵ The importance of these invisible powers of the Old Aeon is clear from Ephesians 6:12, in which Paul declares that the Christian's warfare is in reality against τὰς

¹It is noteworthy that Paul apparently includes himself in the totality of those who were formerly in subjection to the στοιχεῖα. The context suggests that he speaks of the law (cf. vs. 4). In that case Paul is thinking of dependence on the law as equivalent to idolatry.

²Op. cit., p. 190.

³J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 494; A.S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, op. cit., pp. 28f. Contrast Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., pp. 39f.

⁴Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 194; cf. J.B. Lightfoot, Colossians and Philemon, op. cit., p. 154. This notion is particularly important in I Cor. 6:3 where Paul denounces the Christians' practice of going to court in suits against each other. "Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" The courts, as the states which authorise them, are unconsciously controlled by spiritual forces. See O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 193; J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 600. In Tit. 3:1 Christians are encouraged to be in subjection to the ἀρχαὶς ἐξουσίαις, probably as a temporary measure.

⁵Cf. J.B. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 190.

ἀρχὰς, τὰς ἐξουσίας, τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ τούτου,¹
 τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (cf. Eph. 1:21, Col. 1:16),
 not flesh and blood (i.e. mankind). The idea behind these formulae is² a
 hierarchy of demonic forces² that have allied themselves in a rebellious mutiny
 against the supreme Authority of the universe. In this alliance, they have
 become identified with the aeon, and indeed, are the cosmic authorities and
 rulers of the universe.³ So effective is their control over nature, that Paul
 sees the creation in thralldom, that is, in subjection to the forces which
 control it (cf. Rom. 8:19ff.).⁴ The Christian is warned against their insidious
 activity, particularly as it reveals itself in erroneous doctrines (cf. I. Tim.
 4:1, πνεύμασιν . . . διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων).

Over all the intermediary hierarchy of inimical forces, is the sinister
 figure of Satan, ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ αἵρος (Eph. 2:2).⁵ Such a title
 implies the supreme headship of all the personal opposition to God in the Old
 Aeon. He is king of legion intermediary and lesser cosmic spirits (cf. Matt.

¹This phrase, as others in the New Testament, suggests a connection between darkness and the Old Aeon.

²Cf. J.A. Robinson, Ephesians, op. cit., p. 49; H.A.A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 40. In the words of G.H.C. Macgregor, " . . . κοσμοκράτορες is the very word which is used in the Hellenistic mystical writings of the seven supreme astral deities; it occurs in Orphic hymns, in inscriptions, in Gnostic writings, and even in Rabbinic literature". "Principalities and Powers: the Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought", New Testament Studies, Cambridge, Vol. I, #1, 1954, p. 21.

³Cf. O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 103.

⁴Cf. E.Y. Hinks, op. cit., p. 191. Note that Stephen affirms that God "... turned and gave them up (i.e. Israel) to serve the astral host" (Acts. 7:42). For similar ideas see the LXX translation of Deut. 4:19 and Jub. 15:31f. For a similar conception of the relationship of angels to nature see, Jub. 2:1ff., I Enoch 82:10-14, 60:11ff., 4 Ezra 8:20ff. On the whole, Paul's references to these forces is decidedly more pessimistic than the views cited in this literature. These angels and demons are, for Paul, part of the Old Age and identified with its sin. They do God's bidding because they have no choice.

⁵Note the parallel phrase ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (Jn. 12:31, 16:11). See further, G.H.C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 18.

12:26, Mk. 3:22, Lk. 11:15ff.)¹ adding unity and destiny to opposition against God. He demands complete subordination to himself within the aeon. I Corinthians 2:12, mentions τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νόμου in antithesis to the "Spirit from God". The inference may be justified that Paul has Satan in mind.² If this is the case, there is a comparable relationship of the devil to unredeemed humanity as there is in the manifestation of the Holy Spirit in the believer. In Ephesians 2:2 there is an explicit reference to Satan as the "spirit which is now working in the sons of disobedience". Thus, for Christians to leave the faith is equivalent to "turning after Satan" (I Tim. 5:15. Contrast Heb. 6:4f., where partaking of the Holy Spirit is to participate in the power of the Age to Come.), or falling into the judgment, snare, and reproach of the devil (I Tim. 3:6f.). In a striking reference to Satan as ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (II Cor. 4:4), the blindness of the thoughts of unbelievers is ascribed to his devilish activity. He is distinct from the Jews (I Cor. 2:6,8, note the plural τῶν ἀρχόντων) and Gentiles (Eph. 2:2), but he acts in and through them to effect the extension and maintenance of his dominion over the Old Aeon.³ To effect this purpose, he is transformed into an angel of light even as the "false apostles" are transformed into "apostles of Christ" (II Cor. 11:13,14). In a passage fraught with

¹The demonic view of Paul is the same as that of the Synoptics. N.P. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 160. Cf. B. Weiss, *op. cit.*, I, 104, 332. We may compare the slogan written on the ensign of the thousand-group referred to in the Dead Sea Rule of Battle for the Sons of Light, "Wrath of God, full of anger against Belial and all the people of his party, without any survivors". See DuPont-Sommer, *op. cit.*, p. 82. The term Belial is frequently encountered in the D.S.M.D. (cf. e.g. 1.18,24) but the term refers to a man, not Satan himself (cf. 2.19).

²So B. Weiss, *op. cit.*, I, 332. Cf. H.W. Robinson, *Mansfield College Essays*, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

³Note II Tim. 2:26, "... and they (those that oppose themselves) may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, having been taken captive by him unto his will". Cf. II Cor. 11:4.

exegetical difficulty, Paul told the Corinthian Church that the worship of idols or heathen deities was in actuality the worship of demons (I Cor. 10:20f.).¹ In all probability the deity of Satan is of this same character, namely, an assumed and derived divinity, secured through the homage subscribed by lesser spirits and men.² Certainly, Paul did not hold to Satan's deity in any comparable sense to that of God; both Satan and his demonic retinue had been created by Jesus Christ (Col. 2:16). The devil merely stands as a puppet over the Old Aeon; God still rules over the whole Creation.³ Consequently, Paul sees Satan as under an obligation to serve God, as when the incestuous man is delivered into the power

¹Cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 40; N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 160; W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 13. A similar relationship between demons and pagan gods is found in the Old Testament. "They sacrificed unto demons (Τῷ, 'evil spirit, demon,' according to L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, Leiden, 1953, p. 949), not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not." (Deut. 32:17). The phrase *κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων* (I Cor. 10:20) has challenged the attention of many scholars. J.Y. Campbell offers convincing evidence that Paul is referring to partnership with the worshippers, not demons themselves. "*Κοινωνία* and its Cognates in the New Testament", J.B.L., Vol. 51, 1932, p. 378. Agreeing with Campbell is G.V. Jourdan, "*Κοινωνία* in I Corinthians 10:16", J.B.L., Vol. 67, 1948, pp. 122f. Contrast C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., p. 185. It must not be overlooked that the Early Church took a very realistic view of partnership with demons. Note e.g. Clements Recognitions II.71, where Peter is reported to have said, "Everyone who has at any time worshipped idols, and those whom the Pagans call gods, or has eaten of their sacrifices, does not lack an unclean spirit. For he has partaken of that demon whose image he has formed in his mind, and he therefore needs the purification of baptism in order that the unclean spirit may go out of him." Cf. L.G. Rylands, op. cit., p. 210. Note also the Clementine Homilies ix.9 in Clementis Romani, Homiliae Viginti, ed. A.R.M. Dressel, Gottingae, 1853, p. 202. So also the pseudepigraphic Epistle of Barnabas 16:7f. (ed. in Gk. and E.T., S. Sharpe, London, 1880, p. 52) which refers to the heart as a "house of demons". On the relations between demons and the soul, see P. Wernle, op. cit., I, 6 and J.S. Stewart, "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology", S.J.T., Vol. IV, 1951, p. 295ff.

²Note the parallel idea in II Thess. 2:4. Cf. Rev. 13:4.

³This idea may be clearly grasped by comparing II Cor. 4:4 with I Cor. 15:24. Satan's dominion over humanity was instituted through Adam (Rom. 5:12ff.) who traitorously delivered the cosmos (i.e. humanity) into Satan's domain, the Old Aeon. Christ, the Second Adam, through His singular victory on the Cross (Col. 2:15) wrested humanity (Paul calls it the "kingdom") from the aeon and from Satan (cf. Rom. 16:20) to deliver it back to its rightful Owner (I Cor. 15:24).

of the devil for the destruction of the flesh (I Cor. 5:5),¹ or as Hymenaeus and Alexander are committed into Satan's tutelage to unlearn blasphemous speech (I Tim. 1:20). Therefore, the dualism of the New Testament is only temporal (cf. I Thess. 2:18, 3:5, II Thess. 2:3-9) and not metaphysical.²

A problem is introduced by the postulation of an alliance of spirit-forces in opposition against God, and the original good creation. The only commendable answer is the Fall of Satan and his cohorts, although there is no direct statement to that effect.³ The Fall of Adam was neither coincident with, nor did it precipitate the Fall of the evil spirits;⁴ rather, it was the occasion through which the world was brought into subjection to them.⁵ Through Adam's original

¹Cf. H. Weinel, op. cit., p. 368.

²Cf. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 196; J.S. Stewart, "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology", op. cit., p. 300.

³Such passages as Ezekiel's vision of the King of Tyre (ch. 28:11ff.) and Isaiah's depiction of the king of Babylon (14:13f.) have been adduced in favour of a reference to the Fall of Satan. However, the passages are too obscure (cf. A.A. Bevan, "The King of Tyre in Ezekiel XXVIII", J.T.S., Vol. 4, 1903, p. 500) to prove a great deal. If it could be shown that Satan enters the picture at all, it would afford a good example of the devil's incarnation in earthly rulers, an idea which Cullmann finds germane to the term ἐξουσία in Rom. 13:1ff. (cf. Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 194). The closest allusion to an incarnation in Paul, is the eschatological description of the "man of lawlessness" (II Thess. 2:3ff.).

⁴The Genesis account of the Fall clearly maintains that evil existed before Adam's disobedience. Paul concurs apparently in saying that "sin entered into the world" (Rom. 5:12) and asserting that Eve was subjected to external temptation (I Tim. 2:14). H.J. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie, Tübingen, 1911, II, 47, regards the phrase, "sin deceived me", as a conscious reference to the Fall-story in conjunction with II Cor. 11:3, "... the Serpent deceived Eve". Cf. J.E. Thomas, The Problem of Sin in the New Testament, London, 1927, p. 80. In any case, as Brunner says, man is not astute enough to have invented sin. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, op. cit., p. 108.

⁵This view was held both before and contemporaneously with Paul by Jews (cf. supra 158 and J. Armitage Robinson, op. cit., p. 49). C.H. Dodd's objection to this doctrine (See The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 58) makes a false antithesis between the effect of Adam's sin and the will of God. Even the Genesis account clearly establishes that the curse of God was pronounced in consequence to Adam's disobedience.

transgression, not only was sin able to gain a strangle-hold on mankind, but the whole cosmos (man and nature) became part of the Old Aeon.¹ Thus, evil spirits, mankind, and the material creation were united in the direct violation of the original intention of the Creation.² Paul refers to this thralldom as the subjection of the creation (κτίσις) to vanity (ματαιότης); it is in the "bondage of corruption" (Rom. 8:20f.). "Vanity" at once suggests a connection with the heathen deities, in that μάταιος is a standing term for the gods of the Gentiles in the Septuagint.³ An actual relationship was seen by Paul to exist between the demons, the heathen deities, and the rest of creation. Man's subjection to the power of sin is the counterpart to the wilful offering of allegiance to pagan deities and its consequent corruption.⁴ It is here, that the true nature of sin appears as self-asserted rebellion against God.⁵ For this reason, Paul saw the cosmos and all of its constituents involved in sin.

κόσμος may have a narrower meaning than αἶψα in some instances. It is used to designate the world of men as a totality (cf. Rom. 5:12, 3:6, I Cor. 6:2, 11:32, II Cor. 5:19, 1:12).⁶ The identification of the cosmos with the Aeon is

¹Cf. B. Weiss, op. cit., p. 332; J. St.J. Thackeray, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op. cit., p. 39. It is erroneous to see an antithesis between Paul's declarations on the origin of sin as due to 1) the disobedience of Divine Law, and 2) to the influence of evil spirits. See K. Lake, op. cit., pp. 400f.

²Cf. M. Goguel, op. cit., p. 225. Note Gen. 6:11f. where the whole earth is corrupted because of the sin of all flesh.

³Cf. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, op. cit., p. 107.

⁴This is the theme of Rom. 1:18ff. "God gave them up" repeatedly emphasizes the passing of man from the dominion of God to that of idolatry and sin. Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 59.

⁵"Sin" in Bible Key Words, (T.W.N.T.), op. cit., p. 78.

⁶J.J. Van Oosterzee, The Theology of the New Testament, trans. M.J. Evans, London, 1870, p. 272.

clear from the fact that the term still bears the connotation of sinfulness.¹ The emphasis does not lie on humanity as such, but on man as a part of αἰῶν οὐρανόσ, ² and consequently sinful. For this reason, κόσμος is used as the antithesis to the New Humanity in a number of instances (cf. e.g. I Cor. 1:20f., 27f., Eph. 2:2, I Cor. 6:2).³ The significance of the believer's deliverance from the forces of the cosmos is readily seen in the earliest Christian confessions which refer to the defeat and subjection of these powers by Jesus.⁴ Paul, therefore, warns against collusion with the "world" lest his believing audience be included in its judgment (I Cor. 11:32). Says R. Bultmann very much to the point:

This means that 'Kosmos' is an eschatological concept. It denotes the world of men and the sphere of human activity as being, on the one hand, a temporary thing hastening towards its end, and on the other hand, the sphere of anti-godly power under whose sway the individual who is surrounded by it has fallen. It is the sphere of 'the rulers of this age' (I Cor. 2:6,8) and of 'the god of this age' (II Cor. 4:4).⁵

The Implication of Mankind in the Old Aeon through Adam

1. Mankind's Betrayal into the Domain of Death. - We have already discussed the corporate judgment of Adam, the decree that he and his posterity should all die. But the full significance of this judgment cannot be realized without seeing with Paul that sin and death are the bonds by which humanity is held in the thralldom

¹A. Nygren, "Christ and the Forces of Destruction," S.J.T., Vol. IV, 1951, p. 336.

²Cf. E.C. Rust, *op. cit.*, p. 199; B. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 331. We may well agree with this scholar that the pre-Messianic age (הַיָּמִים הַהֵם) of current Jewish thought affords the background of Paul's conception of the aeon, since for Judaism also, this period was ungodly and wicked. *Ibid.*, pp. 331f.

³Cf. F. Prat, *op. cit.*, II, 419ff.

⁴O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

⁵*Theology of the New Testament*, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

of the Old Age. Death (as sin), was personalized¹ in such a manner in the mind of Paul, that he speaks of its domain as a realm over which it rules autocratically (cf. ἐβασίλευσεν in Rom. 5:14,17).² This realm includes Adam's corporate race.³ Since it is the real ruler of man's particular part of the aeon, it is called the "last enemy".⁴ Of death as the rool of Satan, E.Y. Hinks says, "In death Paul sees a personal malignant activity and a malignant being destroying men. The blighting malady which he had thought of sending on the Corinthian offender would be Satan working evil on him."⁵

The Apostle further characterizes death as a sphere in which men are immersed. To be in the position of the heathen is to be dead in tresspasses and sins (Eph. 2:1,5, Col. 2:13). In this passage it is parallel to "uncircumcision" indicating separation, cf. Eph. 2:11f.). The scope of death's kingdom is world-wide (including animate and inanimate, Rom. 8:20;³ Jews and Gentiles, the conclusion of the argument in Rom. 1:18-3:20⁴), and coterminus with the aeon itself (cf. I Cor.

¹P. Feine, op. cit., p. 268; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 135. Personification may reflect the Jewish belief in the Angel of Death, God's instrument in slaying the Egyptians. His role prompted a considerable amount of fanciful speculation in Jewish thought.

²Cf. A. Nygren, Romans, op. cit., pp. 22f.

³E.H. Wahlstrom, op. cit., pp. 26, 61; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 143. J.A.T. Robinson says appropriately, "The universality of death as the destiny of man is thus not a natural fact like the mortality of the σαρξ." Op. cit., p. 35.

Adam's role is analogous to a traitorous ambassador who surrenders his country to the king of an alien empire.

⁴Cf. A. Nygren, "Christ and the Forces of Destruction," op. cit., p. 367.

⁵Op. cit., p. 191.

⁶See O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 101.

⁷Ch. E.H. Wahlstrom, op. cit., p. 29.

15:22f.). Sin and death, which are, from the human standpoint, the fundamental characteristics of the Age, were united and established in Adam.¹ Only in Christ, the Last Adam, is the dominion of death relinquished in its moral (separation from God and sin) and physical aspects. Because of Christ's victory over the power of death, Paul exults: ποῦ σου θάνατε, τὸ νίκος; ποῦσου θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον (I Cor. 15:55) and foresees the abolishment of death altogether (II Tim. 1:10).

2. Man's Subjection to the Power of Sin. - Besides the dominion of death in the Old Aeon, Paul posits regal authority to sin (Rom. 5:21; cf. 6:12,14, 7:9,11).² Sin is the sting, goad, or weapon (κέντρον) which is the means of death's continued dominion over mankind (I Cor. 15:56).³ "Like a harsh tyrant, (it) holds men enslaved (Rom. 6:6, 20, 7:14), paying men for its service the miserable wage of death (Rom. 6:23)."⁴ While one might be prone to consider the choice of evil as an evidence of freedom, "sin" actually took the part of determinism (Rom.

¹A. Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, op. cit., p. 221. Paul uses the term death in its broader meaning, that it, as separation from God (cf. I Tim. 5:6 with Lev. 18:5 where the Old Testament relates righteousness with life). The figure originates in the fate which sin entails (cf. J. Orr, op. cit., p. 277). It is a natural deduction from the Genesis account. Adam was warned concerning the forbidden tree, "... in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (2:17). Adam did not die on that literal day but continued to live for several hundred years. Nevertheless, it was an existence in death in lieu of the Divine sentence. Paul teaches that this sentence, as well as the ban from the fellowship of God, involves all of Adam's race. Cf. W. Beyschlag, op. cit., II,57.

²Cf. H. Weinél, op. cit., p. 245; A. Nygren, "Christ and the Forces of Destruction", op. cit., p. 367; J.J. Van Oosterzee, op. cit., p. 272. Theodore Zahn sees in the words βασιλεύειν and κυριεύειν (6:14), the key to the interpretation of Rom. 5:12-21. Introduction to the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1909, Vol. I, 374. In the thinking of the ancient world, abstractions could be regarded as active powers, almost beings. W. Wrede, op. cit., pp. 92f. Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 58.

³A. Nygren, "Christ and the Forces of Destruction", op. cit., p. 367.

⁴J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 515.

7:17,20).¹ Consequently, the significance of God's giving men up (Rom. 1:24, 26,28) is that they were released into the power of sin which in turn leads to destruction.² We must be aware that Paul does not have in mind sinful acts or unrighteousness as a quality, but an active, powerful, external principle, that organically produces its fruit, the evil deed (Rom. 7:17).³ The personification which is used to describe sin, is the clear indication of its reality to Paul who saw it in conjunction with the human will producing a radical antagonism against the law of God, the expression of His will.⁴ In human nature, it is the corrupting influence which E. Brunner characterizes in this manner:

It (the Bible) conceives sin, the contradiction, wholly ontologically, so that the whole nature of the individual human being, as well as the numerical totality of all human beings, is affected by it, and it is quite impossible to isolate the individual moment, or act, or individual human being; at the same time it conceives it as wholly personally deliberate, so that nothing neutral, no natural element, is admitted as a ground of explanation.⁵

Sin, by its very nature, acts in an organic way. Just as 4 Ezra saw the evil seed sown in the heart of Adam growing to bear the fruit of corruption in

¹Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 36.

²Cf. A. Nygren, op. cit., pp. 366f. See F.R. Barry, Christianity and Psychology, 5th ed., London, 1933, p. 286.

³Cf. O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, op. cit., Vol. I, 38; Primitive Christianity, op. cit., pp. 289f.; J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, op. cit., p. 105; H.F. Rall, op. cit., p. 37; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 61; H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 33; W. Wrede, op. cit., pp. 92f.; E.H. Wahlstrom, op. cit., p. 29.

⁴Cf. P. Feine, op. cit., p. 268; H.F. Rall, op. cit., p. 39.

⁵Man In Revolt, op. cit., p. 117. J. Bright puts it well: "We have to do with sin: man's total and corporate failure in the realm of righteousness, a failure which places a world of justice and peace forever beyond his grasp as if it were some lost Eden guarded by Cherubs' flaming sword. And this is surely something beyond nagging or reforming; it is man's inescapable dilemma." Op. cit., p. 247. Cf. Phythian-Adams, The Fulness of Israel, Oxford, 1948, p. 20.

his progeny, Paul saw all human sin as the development of the details of the original transgression.¹ It has organization and structure. It provides a spiritual *κοινωνία* of darkness (Eph. 5:8,11; cf. I Tim. 5:22, I Jn. 1:6, II Jn. 11),² which exists in radical opposition to the light. It forms a kingdom whose extent embraces the whole human race. It is a force³ which rules in such a manner that Paul may refer to the "law of sin in my members" (Rom. 7:23).⁴ Sin, moreover, produces a sphere in which the unredeemed dwell (*ἐπιμένω*, Rom. 6:1); this realm is the domain of Satan (Acts 26:18) and therefore identifiable with the Old Age.⁵

¹Cf. A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, op. cit., p. 218. R. Bultmann, properly draws a distinction between Gnostics and Jews, who find the reason for sin in some prior cause; for Paul sin came in by sinning. Theology of the New Testament, op. cit., p. 251. Cf. J.E. Thomas, op. cit., p. 85; J.S. Stewart, op. cit., p. 27.

²L.S. Thornton, The Common Life ..., op. cit., p. 13.

³Cf. C. Weizsacker, op. cit., I, 148; H. Weinel, op. cit., p. 244; C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., p. 47. For the passages in point see "Sin" in Bible Key Words, (T.W.N.T.), op. cit., p. 51. "It is difficult to decide how much of this to regard with Dibelius, as referring to the demon, Sin, playing the part of Satan in Rom. 6f. and how much with Feine, as mere poetic imagery. How fluid the boundary lines are between these New Testament forms of the conception of sin is well illustrated in the Johannine literature (cf. Jn. 8:34, I Jn. 3:5; Jn. 8:21, 24)." Ibid., p. 52; cf. p. 80. It is questionable whether Brunner (quoted above; note the statement "Sin never becomes a quality or even a substance" ... It is always the action-decision. Man In Revolt, op. cit., p. 148) or H.R. MacIntosh who denies that sin has any objective existence as "a power in *rerum natura*", ("Sin", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J. Hastings, Vol. XI, Edinburgh, 1920, p. 538), are altogether in agreement with Paul. If Paul held sin to be an objective power, much of our modern thinking is out of step with his. Cf. F.R. Tennant, The Origin and Propagation of Sin, Cambridge, 1906, p. 173; S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., pp. 254f.; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 145; G.B. Stevens, Theology of the New Testament, op. cit., p. 351.

⁴Cf. P. Wernle, op. cit., I, 229f.; B. Weiss, op. cit., pp. 333f.

⁵It is likely that the close relationship of Satan to sin, explains the element of personification (J.E. Thomas, op. cit., p. 80, claims that sin takes the place of Satan in Romans.). Sanday and Headlam discuss the problem well: "His language is of the nature of personification and does not necessarily imply a person; yet, when we take it in connexion with other language elsewhere, we see that in the last resort he would have said that there was a personal agency at work." Op. cit., p. 146. Cf. M. Dibelius, op. cit., p. 118; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 63, "We can think of ... sin as an incarnation of Satan". It seems that one cannot maintain that sin was actually a person in the Apostle's opinion,

Sin is the primary characteristic of the Old Aeon. Ἀὐτὸν οὐδὲν is thoroughly and irremediably wicked;¹ hence, redemption must be extended from without (Gal. 1:4, Eph. 2:5, Rom. 8:2, Col. 1:13).² Sin is the expression and power of the age,³ providing the bonds whereby its subjects are brought into and kept in thralldom (cf. Rom. 5:12, 21, 3:9, Gal. 3:22). In Romans 6-8, a glance will confirm the view that Paul considered sin to be man's master. Slavery, bondage, legal power, among other ideas, characterize the nature of sin's control.

It is only in this context that one may see the significance of Paul's doctrine of sin and redemption. Again, it was his conception of the solidarity of mankind which allowed him to postulate the view that Adam was responsible for man's implication in the Aeon and his subjection to its external powers (Rom. 5:12).⁴ But it is not Adam apart from his race, as though he might have made his decision to betray the race (cf. I Tim. 2:14) in isolation from the group which he realistically represented. Although he acts for the totality of mankind and his decision binds them, as a corporate personality, they also act in him to effect the first transgression, and he acts in them, down through the ages of history. It is not Original Sin,⁵ in its usual exposition, but mankind

as some scholars have argued (cf. e.g. O. Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, op. cit., 189f.; H. Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 118, 126; cf. E.C. Rust, op. cit., p. 9), without encountering serious problems of exegesis. Cf. F. Prat, op. cit., II, 66; H.R. Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 538; W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 18.

¹J. Weiss, op. cit., pp. 604f.

²A. Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, op. cit., p. 57. C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., p. 29.

³Cf. H.J. Holtzmann, op. cit., pp. 50ff.

⁴Cf. J.J. Van Oosterzee, op. cit., p. 272; N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 127; G.B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology, op. cit., p. 124; O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, op. cit., p. 37; F.C. Baur, op. cit., II, 187; H.J. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 55.

⁵See J. Caird's brilliant analysis of the problem in his Gifford Lectures, Fundamental Principles of Christianity, Glasgow, 1899, Vol. 1, 210f. Cf. W. Beyschlag, op. cit., II, 60; C. Weizsacker, op. cit., I, 149; W. Wrede, op. cit., p. 94; B. Weiss, op. cit., p. 334; F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 265; F.C. Baur, op. cit., II, 185. But note A.G. Hebert, The Throne of David, op. cit., pp. 170f.

betrayed and betraying itself into the thralldom of sin in the cosmos, which is Paul's doctrine.¹

3. "Flesh" Implicated in the Old Aeon. - We pick up now where we left off, to examine the second aspect of Paul's usage of the term *σάρξ*. Beyond the connotation of "flesh" as a physical substance or human relationship is a designation of *σάρξ* as a continuum,² a type of cohesive being³ which is the captive and seat of sin.⁴ This aspect concerns the flesh as a part of the Aeon and consequently its standing in opposition to God.⁵ The flesh comes to symbolise mankind in thralldom to the ruling power of sin in the Aeon.⁶ Thus,

¹Cf. H. Weinel, op. cit., p. 245.

²C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 61.

³J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 606.

⁴Cf. H. Weinel, op. cit., p. 243; P. Feine, op. cit., p. 316; C.A.A.Scott, op. cit., p. 47; C.H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 60. It is not impossible that Paul might have seen a connection between *σάρξ* as a part of the corrupted creation (Rom. 8:19ff.) and its dominion by sin. However, this idea could only have provided the starting-point for his remarkable doctrine. The flesh is not evil in itself (cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 19; A.B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 202) but it is frail, susceptible to the power of some external force. This idea comes directly from the Old Testament (cf. H.W. Robinson, Mansfield College Essays, op. cit., pp. 284f.); but, it is noteworthy that the slogan on the ensign of the hundred-group cited in the Rule of Battle for the Sons of Light, says, "From God comes the energy to fight against all sinful flesh." Cf. DuPont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 82; note also the Song of Triumph, Ibid., p. 83. In the Manual of Discipline, there are some ideas which bear a remarkable similarity to those of Paul. "But I belong to wicked humanity/ And to the assembly of perverse flesh./ My iniquities, my transgression, my sin/ (Together with the perversities of my heart)/ Belong to the assembly of worms and of things that move in darkness./ For a man's way is (not) his own;/ A man does not direct his steps;/ For to God belongs the decision, ... Col. 9.9f.

⁵See J.A.T. Robinson's admirable treatment, op. cit., pp. 24f.

⁶Cf. F. Prat, op. cit., II, 73, 76; E.J. Bicknell, op. cit., pp. 22f.; C. Weizsäcker, op. cit., I, 152. This scholar thinks that Paul arrives at the idea of universal sin from the universality of the flesh (cf. ibid., p. 153). Actually, Paul says that his doctrine comes from the Scripture (cf. Rom. 3:10ff.). It might have been due to a divine decree or otherwise.

to be ἐν σαρκί is to say that one is subject to the powers which control the flesh. "In Romans 7:6, 'that wherein we were holden' refers to the σάρξ: it is that by virtue of which the powers have their grip over us."¹ ἐν σαρκί is far removed from the Greek idea of the flesh as the material body or even the Old Testament where man is a manifestation of the totality of all flesh. In Paul's theology, "flesh" is a sphere controlled by alien powers.² As long as one remains in it, he is subjected to these forces. The end of life κατὰ σάρκα is death (Rom. 8:12). With the acquisition of the new life in Christ, the believer is not longer in the flesh but in the Spirit (Rom. 8:9; cf. Rom. 7:5). "Flesh" and "Spirit" are not two spheres in which one can live at the same time. Only one of these entities can determine man's existence.³ Thus, Paul tells the Roman Christians that they are no longer "in the flesh" but "in the Spirit" (8:9; Cf. Gal. 5:13).⁴ Formerly, existence ἐν τῇ σαρκί meant the dominion of the passions of sin in our members (cf. Gal. 5:19ff.) resulting in death (Rom. 7:5); now however, there is no longer any condemnation for us who do not walk κατὰ σάρκα (Rom. 8:1,4).

The enmity of the Aeon against God is also ascribed by Paul to the σάρξ (Rom. 8:7; Gal. 5:17; cf. Rom. 2:28f., 7:6). It is for this reason that

¹J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 22. By the flesh, the individual is connected with the cosmos. J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 606.

²J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 22f.

³R. Asting, Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum, Göttingen, 1930, p. 193. The carnal Christian (σαρκίνοισ, σαρκίνοι I Cor. 3:1,3) is living as though he still remained in the thralldom of the Aeon, in spite of the redemption of Christ, which not only makes such an existence unnecessary, but utterly reprehensible (cf. Rom. 6:1ff. 7:6, 8:1ff., Gal. 5:15ff.). Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 24 n.4; see also H. Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 123.

⁴The contrast between the two aeons is evident. Cf. E.H. Wahlstrom, op. cit., p. 16.

Paul describes the flesh as *σάρξ καὶ αἷμα* (Rom. 8:3). Surely, to be "in the flesh" obviates any possibility of pleasing God (Rom. 8:8, Gal. 3:3), and sowing to the flesh can only culminate in corruption (Gal. 6:8).

It is a most essential element in Paul's doctrine to conceive of the flesh (i.e. the sphere) as a sort of living or organic whole. When the Apostle comes to expound his doctrine of the atonement of Christ, he stresses the humanity of Christ. Through His assumption of a body and death, sin's control of the flesh was successfully challenged; consequently, those that are included in Him, are extracted from the Old Aeon and its malignant powers, sin, death, and the Law. (Rom. 8:3, 7:4).¹ By this particular type of redemption, Christ was able to reverse the subjection of the flesh to sin which Adam inaugurated.² This is the core of Paul's theology, a core so often misunderstood because our thought is so completely dominated by traditional Western individualism. Throughout the exposition of his doctrine, Paul's mind must be seen in its determination

¹Cf. J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 434.

²Cf. E.C. Rust, op. cit., p. 229; F. Prat, op. cit., II, 76; P. Feine, op. cit., p. 271. Finally, we must admit with H.A.A. Kennedy, that there is no defined relationship between the idea of corporate sin and the sinfulness of the flesh (Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 40; so also M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 169). Dickson's reply to Holsten and Pfeleiderer, who erroneously claim that Paul's thought requires the conception of an integral relationship between flesh and sin in Rom. 8:3, is correct in part; sin is not objectively destroyed (cf. op. cit., pp. 333ff. and refs.). But Paul's doctrine cannot be severed from the context of the Old Aeon in which "flesh" is human nature under the dominion of sin. All that Paul is saying in Rom. 8:3 is that Christ became a man (the word *θεοῦ υἱ* is added to distinguish Jesus' earthly existence from all other human existence which is invariably sinful, K. Barth, Romans, op. cit., p. 167), yet apart from the actual commission of sin (cf. A.B. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 281ff.). Unfortunately we cannot ask Paul the question whether Christ was in some way involved in the corporate sin of the race in Adam. Maybe this is what lies behind II Cor. 5:21.

by Old Testament¹ and Early Jewish conceptions.²

Paul's doctrine of man in the flesh, under the dominion of sin and death is not merely a re-statement of the Old Testament and Jewish conceptions. The plight of man's involvement through the solidarity of the race in its distance from God³ is more poignant to the Apostle because of the light which is cast upon it by the New Age. The striking nature of the human dilemma apart from redemption is two-fold. 1) Man because of the weakness of the flesh, is completely unable to fulfil his responsibility to God.⁴ 2) Man, besides being

¹Of supreme importance is the conception of the *σάρξ* as a totality (cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, *Theology of the Epistles*, *op. cit.*, p. 129) which harks back to the Old Testament conception of *לֶשֶׁת* (cf. *supra* p.40.). But more than this is the collusion of Paul and the Old Testament in the ascription of an ethical quality to the flesh, an idea altogether undeveloped by the Rabbis. W.D. Davies says, "There are no expressions in Rabbinic Judaism which literally correspond to the use of *σάρκινος*, *σαρκικός* and *πνευματικός* and *ψυχικός* in Paul" (*op. cit.*, p. 20). There are passages in Jewish literature which establish a connection between the yetzer and the body in such a manner that the latter is completed under the domination of the former (cf. W.D. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 27 and *supra* 152ff. The Old Testament distinction between *nephesh* and *ruah* is analogous in some ways to the conflict between the *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα* (Gal. 5:17); *ψυχικός* and *πνευματικός* (I Cor. 2:14f.). Cf. T.A. Lacey, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

²A concerted attempt to correlate Paul's use of the term "flesh" with the Jewish doctrine of the yetzer hara will produce some favorable results (cf. W.D. Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 24ff.; N.P. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 150). As the yetzer was not in its origin, or in itself, for that matter, evil, being created by God (cf. G.F. Moore, *op. cit.*, I, 482f.; W.D. Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 24), it did lead man to sinful acts. One might for example, substitute yetzer for "flesh" in such passages as Rom. 13:14, "... make no provision for the flesh, unto its lusts" (*εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν*), or Rom. 8:12, "... we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh" (cf. Rom. 7:25), without seriously affecting the meaning of the passage in question. We noted further, that the Evil Impulse preceded the Fall, but has since, more or less, gained mastery over the race. What is more, we noted that R. Judah (A.D. 150) related the yetzer hara to this age, and that in the world to come it would be slain (Suk. 52a; Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, 482f.). Such passages as Baba Bathra 16a, Eccclus. 21:27, T. Asher 1.9, T. Benjamin 6.1 and Kiddushin 81a (see *supra* p.163), indicate at least a modified conception of the control of the Aeon by the forces of Satan and evil spirits working through the Evil Impulse.

³Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 31. This is what N. Söderblom has called a mysterious solidarity of the individual and the race which is a "solidarity of woe and of a curse". *Op. cit.*, p. 10; cf. p. 27.

⁴This point well illustrates the contrast between the position of Paul and Hellenistic dualism where there is no responsibility. Cf. W.D. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

frail, is engulfed in his solidarity with the race within the domain of powers too great for him to master. Both ideas characterize Paul's conception of the Aeon, the evil inversion of the New Aeon inaugurated by Jesus Christ. It is this same inversion which must explain the true nature of the Adam-Christ typology. Adam involved the race in the Aeon by virtue of his determinative headship; Christ, by incorporating the New Humanity into Himself brings them into the New Age (II Cor. 5:17, Rom. 8:21, I Cor. 15:51ff.).

4. "Law" Implicated in the Old Aeon. - As strange as it might at first appear, Paul, who taught that the Law originated with Divine approval and whose commands were holy, just, and good (Rom. 7:12; cf. vs. 14, 17f., I Tim. 1:8ff. Note also the practice of Paul according to Acts 16:3, 21:18ff.), also thought of the Law as being implicated in the Old Age. In this context, the Law was one of the forces of the aeon that had joined with sin and death in the subjection of mankind.¹ In the words of J.A.T. Robinson, "If sin is the accomplice of death, the law is the instrument of sin."² Paul calls the Law (subjectively, not objectively) "the power (*δύναμις*, Rom. 7:9) sin and beguiled him (Rom. 7:11). The Law *κατεργάζεται* "works" wrath, for without it, sin could not exist except in a submerged form.³ The Law gains the bridgehead or footing (*ἀφορμή* Rom. 7:8,11) whereby sin gains control over the whole man, thereby causing sin

¹Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 63; A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p. 127; W. Bousset, Kurios Christos, op. cit., p. 193.

²Op. cit., p. 36. Cf. T. Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, op. cit., p. 362.

³Cf. Rom. 3:20; N.P. Williams, op. cit., p. 132. "Wrong actions done without knowledge that they are wrong are not imputed to the doer" (Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 144).

to abound (Rom. 5:20).¹ It gives sin's reign full power.² It deceives those that put their confidence in it with the intent of securing eternal life through the fulfilment of its injunctions (Gal. 3:11f.). And with this failure of the Law to give life, Paul found an empirically conclusive argument that subjection to the Law is worse than useless, an emphatic confirmation that it is one of the partners of the Old Aeon.

Paul does not hesitate to posit that, just as man is enslaved by sin and death, he is equally the thrall of the Law³ (Gal. 4:1-7, 5:1), under it (Gal. 4:21, Rom. 6:14) and subject to its curse (Gal. 3:13).⁴ This latter point corresponds to the sentence of death under which all men in the Old Aeon live.⁵

¹The explanation for Paul's curious view of the Law lies in the observed reaction of the *σάρξ* to an injunction. Not only is the flesh weak (Rom. 8:3) and easily beguiled (cf. J.A.T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 37), but it resents the demands of the Law, with the result that the very passions which the Law was supposed to suppress increase their demands for gratification (Rom. 7:7f.). Furthermore, the Law has placed an impossible imposition on the frail human flesh in its requirement that man, through self-effort, attain to divine favor (Rom. 8:8, Gal. 3:3; cf. H. Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 127). Even a man so highly regarded as Abraham could not attain to such a goal; rather, he had to depend on faith alone, whereby the grace of God is offered to the incapable (Gal. 3:6ff., Rom. 4:1ff., 16ff.). The whole point of the passage is found in the weakness of the flesh [i.e. typified in the bodies of Abraham and Sarah, 4:19] contrasted with the strength of the promise. Therefore, Paul concludes that the Law was not given to save men, but to be God's instrument (*παιδαγωγός*) to bring men to life through Christ (Gal. 4:1ff.).

²Cf. F.C. Baur, *op. cit.*, II, 190f.

³Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 37; C.A. Wood, *op. cit.*, pp. 159f.

⁴On the ancient conception of a curse and its implications, see C.H. Dodd, *The Meaning of Paul for Today*, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁵Cf. H. Weinel, *op. cit.*, p. 248. Paul includes the Gentiles under the legal responsibility to God which was anything but a fresh idea when applied to Israel (cf. Rom. 1-3). The Apostle does not clearly state whether the curse of the Jewish law has fallen upon all men, or whether the violation of the innate law also carries a curse which implicates the Gentiles. The latter suggestion poses fewer difficulties.

This contention is confirmed by Colossians 2:14f., where an unmistakable relationship is drawn between the "principalities and powers" on the one hand, and the "ordinances" (i.e. Law), on the other.¹ W. Morgan suggests that the presiding of these powers over the Law implies a malicious interest in prosecuting both its demands and its condemnation to man's undoing.² Thus, Paul sees that the Torah, of divine origin, instead of acting to deliver man from the clutches of sin,³ is itself the instrument of the forces which delight in the destruction of man.⁴ As in the cases of the other powers of the Aeon, man's release from the bondage and curse of the Law is effected through Christ.⁵ Consequently, death (cf. ἀπέθανον, and its parallel identification with Christ) to the Law, is the beginning of life unto God (Gal. 2:19).

But in what sense did Paul see Adam as the means by which mankind was implicated in the bondage and condemnation of the Law? We can only attempt to guess the answer, for there are no explicit references in the Epistles that Adam did involve man in legal subjection directly. At least symbolically, if not actually, Paul attributes to Adam the corporate responsibility for the legal subjection of mankind. He knew the will of God (although the Torah was not given until Moses, Rom. 5:14) which made transgression a possibility.⁶

¹Gal. 4:3 further indicates a relationship between the Law and the Aeon, in that it is identified with the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. It has been impressed into the service of the forces of the Aeon; therefore, Paul says, ὅτι ἡμεῖς νῦν πτωχοὶ, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεῖς δαδουλωμένοι.

²Op. cit., p. 71.

³W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, op. cit., p. 108.

⁴Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 63.

⁵Cf. A.B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 173; D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 166.

⁶J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 35 n.1.

With Adam's betrayal of the race into the power of sin, the Law could have no other effect than to produce an antagonism to the will of God. It is interesting in this context to note that the major part of Romans seven appears to be a personal paraphrase of the Eden temptation.¹ In any case, Paul does not divide responsibility for the subjection of mankind to the powers of the Old Age. Sin, death, flesh, and the Law are all inextricably interconnected in such a manner that the admission of one brings in the rest.

Conclusion

Our intended goal in this general section has been to unravel three dissimilar lines of thought which, more than likely, were not distinguished in Paul's mind. 1) The first is Adam as the father of the race. As its ancestor, he is the origin (Ursprung) of all those general racial characteristics which distinguish mankind from the rest of Creation. One might profitably compare the race to a tree, which although possessing distinct leaves, gives to each leaf a common life and characteristics, since they are organically connected through the stem and the trunk.

2) The second line of thought concerns Adam's role as the realistic representative of the race. This role implies the connotation of the Hebrew conception of the corporate personality of the race in such a manner that all mankind is identifiable with one man; in Paul's doctrine this man is Adam. Because of his representation of the race, Paul posits a universal participation of the race in the original and archetypal transgression of Adam culminating

¹So. P. Fiene, op. cit., p. 275. In that case, sin is equivalent to the serpent which tempts, deceives, and brings death (vvs. 8,11). The divine will is embodied in a commandment (ἐντολή, vvs. 8, 9-12f. It may be significant that Paul does not use νόμος as he normally does.).

in the corporate judgment of the totality of men.¹

3) The third aspect of Paul's doctrine may combine the first two lines of thought,² but adds further, the horizontal solidarity of man under sin, in united opposition to God. The Jewish idea of the two Aeons reached a heightened development by Paul because he had personally experienced the contrast between the Old and the New (cf. Gal. 3:22, ... συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν).

¹Historically, the discussion of the meaning of Rom. 5:12, has been divided between those who think that ἡμαρτον refers to humanity in Adam in some undefinable way, and those that think that it refers to the universality of sin throughout all time. Rabbinic scholars are equally unable to agree on the problem of humanity being involved in guiltless or guilty punishment. Thus, F. Weber says, "Es gibt eine Erschuld, aber keine Erbsünde," but G.F. Moore says, "... his (Adam's) descendants die in consequence of his sin, but not for the guilt of it" (Judaism, op. cit., Vol. I, 476; so also F.R. Tennant, op. cit., p. 167; see further S. Levy's fine discussion, op. cit., pp. 43ff.). In a way, this same problem might have arisen in the Old Testament in the cited cases of corporate justice. It is our opinion that the Old Testament tends to indicate a conception of corporate guilt in the sense of a reatus poenae but not in the sense of a reatus culpa. The Rabbis, being more precise in their thinking and more fearful of attributing injustice to God, do not, in our estimation, hold to a guilty punishment of the race for Adam's sin. Surely, one must not overlook the fact that there is a guilt in a religious sense in Judaism which had nothing to do with the conscious desire or will of the party involved. This is recognized by the cry of the mob made familiar in the Passion Narratives, "His blood be upon us and upon our children" (contrast Jn. 9:2, where corporate punishment is apparently expected without the presence of guilt; hence, the question as to who had committed sin). Cf. W.P. Dickson, op. cit., p. 290; C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 60; E.J. Bicknell, op. cit., pp. 24f.; J. Orr, op. cit., pp. 278ff.

The problem should have certainly appeared artificial to Paul, in view of the fact that individual guilt is inevitably assumed through individual choice (cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., I, 476). One cannot omit the further consideration that the clearer doctrine of Redemption almost requires that the more grammatical interpretation of Rom. 5:12 be upheld, that is, that all men sinned in Adam's sinning just as the New Humanity is made righteous in the one archetypal act of obedience in Christ's death on the Cross.

²Paul unfortunately does not definitely express what the causal connection is that exists between the first transgression and the moral defilement of the race (cf. J.E. Thomas, op. cit., p. 85). H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, op. cit., pp. 112f. and F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., pp. 253f. affirm that there is none (cf. G.B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology, op. cit., p. 37; W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 245); but, W.D. Davies thinks that it is merely

Throughout our presentation of the Pauline views on the solidarity of the race, his dependence on the Old Testament and current Jewish thought has been more or less self-evident. Probably the most important single principle of solidarity used by Paul was the Old Testament conception of the corporate personality of the group.¹ The application of this principle made it possible

undefined (cf. op. cit., p. 31, n.3). This failure to define a connection may be due to the fact that Paul is not desirous of demonstrating the Fall. Maybe his readers are assumed to already know his doctrine. In any case, his purpose is confined to the desire of postulating the restoration of the race through Christ (cf. F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. II, 58; W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, op. cit., pp. 96f.

It appears that such an explanation as B. Weiss expresses, namely, that there is a pernicious influence which passes to the race from Adam through the blood-relationship destroys the parallel between Adam and Christ which the Apostle is attempting to establish (cf. op. cit., I, 331, 336f.; N.P. Williams, op. cit., pp. 124, 131; F. Prat, op. cit., II, 59). Moreover, there is the added difficulty that a physical connection is made to have moral consequences (cf. J. Denney, Studies in Theology, London, 1895, p. 88). It is also generally conceded that such an idea is not common to Judaism (Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., IV, 9, "Eine Erbsunde hat die alte Synagoge nicht gekannt;" cf. W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, op. cit., p. 406; M.-J. Lagrange, St. Paul Epître aux Romains, op. cit., pp. 114, 118).

The well-worn explanation of Paul's doctrine (note e.g. Rom. 5:19) is that he is thinking in forensic terms (cf. O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, op. cit., Vol. 1, 43ff.; C. Weizsacker, op. cit., pp. 148ff.; W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 91) is objectionable on the ground that Paul does not appear to be a legalist (cf. F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 266); nor would it explain the actual universality of sin which Paul declares to be the direct consequence of Adam's sin (cf. F. Prat, op. cit., Vol. 1, 218).

The best answer to our problem is not found in a hereditary bias (cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 40) but an expanded understanding of the implications of the corporate judgment of the race. Not only was the race subjected to the universal penalty of death, but this same decree delivered the race into the power of sin culminating in man's implication in the Old Aeon and his thralldom to the forces of evil, both moral and otherwise. Now man, has no choice but to join in the corporate opposition of humanity toward God (cf. E. Brunner, The Christian Doctrine and Redemption, op. cit., p. 96; Stauffer, "Eis," T.W.N.T., op. cit., Vol. II, 435f.

¹This principle may have a broader application in the Pauline Epistles as S. Hanson has attempted to establish. Thus, in Col. 3:9, the figure, "old man" appears to refer to a collective person (cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 119). The same figure is used in Eph. 4:22, but no mention is made of the members; on the other hand, the antithetical "new man" (4:24) is fully described as a corporate body. That the Apostle has Adam, as a corporate personality in mind, is

for Paul to go far beyond the current ideas of his day to postulate a doctrine of total human implication in sin,¹ as the foundation for his all embracing doctrine of redemption. The debt of the Apostle to current theories of

possible even though there is no mention of the historical figure or his relationship to mankind (cf. S. Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 80. F. Prat too hastily rules out this possibility, maintaining that the title is descriptive of fallen nature inherited from Adam, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, 73; so also A. Nygren, *Romans*, *op. cit.*, pp. 234f. Note that in I Cor. 15:22, 45ff., the emphasis is not on what is inherited from Adam, but the inclusion or exclusion from the corporate personality of Adam or of Christ; cf. L.S. Thornton, *The Common Life ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 144). The familiar contrast which is drawn between the "old man" and the "new man" (i.e. Christ, cf. vs. 10) may receive added significance from the point that Paul uses Adam in antithesis to Christ. The "old man" is also ascribed "members" (cf. Col. 3:5,8) which are highly spiritualized (i.e. anger, wrath, malice, etc.). It may be that his thought turns on the point of the nature of his conception of the Aeon. Says S. Hanson, "'The old man' is Adam, who in his person included the aeon of sin; Adam is set forth here with all of his doings ... Adam is the incarnation of the old aeon" (*op. cit.*, p. 80). Adam provides a fellowship for his race as Christ does for the New Humanity. In this fellowship of evil, the original transgression of Adam developed into various forms of specific iniquity which in turn control and subjugate mankind. At this juncture we must marvel at the versatility of the Apostle's thought. There is no sin apart from personal commission (cf. A. Nygren, *Romans*, *op. cit.*, p. 234). As all men exist in Adam (considered as a corporate personality) they cannot exist apart from sin, and its concomitant ally, death (I Cor. 15:22). Therefore, Paul says, "... ye have put off the old man with his deeds," when referring to a Christian; that is, the believer has left the sphere or aeon of which Adam is the head and where his deeds (manifested in the multiplicity of his human branches) are characteristic. There is a very important difference between Adam used in this way (comparable to Israel or Abraham incarnate in Israel) and Paul's doctrine of Christ Who represents His race as its living Lord. Adam is used in an allegorical context (cf. C.S. Lewis' definition of allegory in the *Allegory of Love*, Oxford, 1936, pp. 45ff. It is, in brief, a method of expression, useful in the explanation of an obscure or difficult reality; cf. C. Chavasse, *op. cit.*, p. 100) comparable to the son born *ἡρὰ σάρκα* (i.e. Ishmael) who is a corporate collectivity of all who remain under the bondage of Law (Gal. 4:22ff.). Of course, it is not merely allegorical, since Paul posits a causal connection between the evil action of the first man and those of all succeeding men (Rom. 5:19).

A symbol of metonym cited as a parallel to the "old man" (cf. S. Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 84) is the figure "body of sin" (Rom. 6:6). Sin is pictured as a corporate person which has a body which Christ has destroyed (Rom. 6:6; cf. 8:3). It is going too far to postulate that the "body of sin" is an incarnation of Adam or Satan, an antithetical expression to the "Body of Christ". By comparing Rom. 8:10 (cf. Col. 2:11), a reference to the individual personality (note the Heb. sense of *שׁוּבָה*) dominated by sin is made more likely. In that case the meaning is the same as that found in Gal. 2:20, where Paul declares, "I have been crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live ..." (cf. Col. 3:3). W.P. Williams thinks the figure of the "old man" and other similar designations (e.g., "sin", "the sinful body", "the body of death") refer to the yetzer hara (cf. *op. cit.*, p. 150; W.D. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 26). This is true to greater extent in some cases than in others. Particularly in the case of the "old man" the scope of Paul's thought appears to have a broader background.

¹Cf. H.R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 538; W. Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 12; H.

corporate justice, transferable demerit, the horizontal extension of life and flesh (which to the ancient Hebrew would correspond to the extension of personality)¹ as frail and yet a totality which may have more or less a psychic or organic life,² is self-evident. It is a debt which is primarily one of background. Paul may not be accused of parroting ideas of his Jewish contemporaries. Indeed, he makes more direct use of Old Testament conceptions than those of the Rabbis. But "stimulus diffusion" is the phrase which best describes Paul's application of Old Testament and Early Jewish conceptions of the solidarity of the human race.

Our primary interest will be to analyze Paul's conception of the unity of the race as it is re-created in its representative Head, Christ Jesus. Although Paul's indebtedness to Old Testament and Early Jewish conceptions of solidarity will be self-evident to a large extent, the Apostle adds great significance to the fact that Christ is alive forever and unlimited by spatial considerations. In personal existence Christ may therefore unite in Himself all generations and nations. This is the great contribution of the Apostle and the core of his theology.

The solidarity of Christ with the Church is viewed at one time as incorporation and at another as realistic representation. The latter view is

Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 122; C.N. Cochrane, op. cit., p. 241; P.C. Boyland, op. cit., p. 88 n.1. Even so pessimistic a writer as 4 Ezra does not consider the commission of sin as a necessary fate (cf. P. Feine, op. cit., p. 272).

¹ Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 14; E.C. Rust, op. cit., p. 97.

² Cf. H.W. Robinson, Mansfield College Essays, op. cit., p. 286.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOLIDARITY OF THE NEW HUMANITY IN CHRIST AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE CONCEPTIONS OF SOLIDARITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND EARLY JUDAISM

Introduction

We must proceed now to discuss Paul's conception of the solidarity of the Church. It is quite correct to see three levels of solidarity in the Epistles. The first level with the lowest common denominator is the whole of the human race. The second level is the Jewish Race as a national ethnic group.¹ The third and highest level of solidarity is that which characterizes the New Humanity. It is the unity of the Church which occupies by far the major part of Paul's teaching on the solidarity of the race.

Our primary interest will be to analyze Paul's conception of the unity of the race as it is re-created in its representative Head, Christ Jesus. Although Paul's indebtedness to Old Testament and Early Jewish conceptions of solidarity will be self-evident to a large extent, the Apostle adds great significance to the fact that Christ is alive forever and unlimited by spacial considerations. In personal existence Christ may therefore unite in Himself all generations and nations.² This is the great contribution of the Apostle and the core of his theology.

The solidarity of Christ with the Church is viewed at one time as incorporation and at another as realistic representation.³ The latter idea is

¹The solidarity of national Israel is treated in Appendix B.

²N.A. Dahl cryptically says, "Der Sohn Gottes ist die Verkörperung des Volkes Gottes," op. cit., p. 166. Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., pp. 28f.; P. Feine, op. cit., p. 304.

³See e.g. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 159; cf. C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., p. 156; A.B. Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, New York, 1907, p. 178.

more external; consequently, it served to indicate the relationship of Adam to the human race. Incorporation is a conception which best describes the solidarity of the Church as the Body of Christ. It is an organic unity pervaded by the resurrection life of the raised Lord. It is this life which is the basis for the solidarity of the New Humanity.¹ Because the Church shares in this life, the experiences of Christ are imparted to it.² The identification of the re-born Humanity with Christ is even more realistic than the solidarity of the human race with Adam. The limits of the two races are clearly defined, since Paul's teaching on the redemption is dominated by the great principle of solidarity. "The man Christ who willed to share in our existence represents us all. He is the new Adam, the Head of the reborn humanity, who includes all in Himself (Rom. 5:14, 1 Cor. 15:20ff., Col. 1:18, II Cor. 5:14)."³ Over against the old Adam-collectivity, stands the new corporate race welded into one New Man through the Holy Spirit.

These ideas are thoroughly Hebraic. J. Moffatt points out that there are anticipations of Paul's views to be found in the Apocalyptic mysticism which conceived the unity of the elect with the Messiah to be corporate.⁴ In the Old Testament prophets, this conception finds its likely origin, for the Community or remnant is seen to have no independent existence apart from the Messiah⁵ who would identify himself with the lot of the elect and vindicate

¹Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 119; F.C. Baur, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 214.

²Cf. W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 121.

³W. Grossouw, In Christ, trans. from 2nd ed. by M.W. Schoenberg, Westminster, Md., 1952, p. 47.

⁴The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, London, 1938, p. 188. So also A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. W. Montgomery, London, 1931, passim. Contrast C.C. McCown, op. cit., p. 120.

⁵Cf. F.W. Dillistone, The Word of God and the People of God, London, 1948, p. 56; R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 2nd ed., London, 1943, pp. 53ff.

its righteous cause. Such figures as the Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man are particularly good examples.

Still farther back we may see the conception of the realistic identification of the nation with the Davidic king, called the Anointed (i.e. Messiah) of the Lord, who incorporated the nation in himself as the archetypal head. Of an identical character was the Old Testament representation of the relationship of Moses to the tribes of the Exodus Wandering.

Paul's conception of the life of Christ animating the New Race has no exact parallel. The nearest point of correspondence is the conception of the life of the ancestor present through the commonly possessed blood within the kin-group. The Old Testament conception of the corporate personality of the family is the counterpart to Paul's conception of the solidarity between Christ and the redeemed Family over which He is Lord (Eph. 1:22).

In a cursory reading of the Pauline Epistles, it would be natural for one to conclude that there is a unity of the Church apart from any relationship to Christ; that is, that Paul conceived of the Church as an ideal entity which was prior to the individuals who compose it.¹ The plausibility of such a view gains weight from the emphasis on the doctrine of election and predestination. It was on the basis of foreknowledge and foreordination that the incontrovertible will of God constituted the corporate entity which found its manifestation in the New Age.²

¹Cf. Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 123. Ritschl's theology emphasized the idea of the priority of the Church as a collective whole, especially as the object of the redemptive work of Christ (cf. Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, II, 160, 216f. and the summary of Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 122).

²It is well to remember that this same idealistic conception described Israel in the Old Testament on the basis of the covenant and the eternal election of Israel.

There are, moreover, those passages which describe the unity of the Church as actualized through love and the fellowship (κοινωνία) of the saints.

Within the circle of this fellowship there is an intensified recognition of responsibility only to be compared with the common responsibility within the closely knit family.¹ Thus, Paul calls the Church a "household of faith" (οἰκεῖοι τῆς πίστεως, Gal. 6:10; cf. Eph. 2:19). Paul refers to its members (as does the rest of the New Testament) as "brethren" and their love as φιλαδελφία² (cf. I Thess. 4:9ff., Rom. 12:9f., Col. 1:4,8, 3:14, I Cor. 13, passim, where love is the greatest asset to the proper exercise of the gifts of the Spirit within the Body).

Such terminology was not chosen to indicate a pious sympathy which should exist between human beings, but it was an attempt to designate the reality of the spiritual kinship which united individuals from all nationalities, classes, and positions into one unity. This solidarity stands throughout the New Testament as a unity over against the solidarity of the cosmos of men which are "the children of the flesh" (Gal. 3:7, 4:25,29) and "those without" (τῶν ἔξωθεν, I Tim. 3:7).³ It is for this reason that Israel "after the flesh" is not in

¹ We must point out in passing that Paul's conception of the solidarity of the family is quite obviously Hebraic as it is reflected in I Cor. 7:14. The unbelieving partners as well as the children of a mixed marriage are sanctified (ἁγιάσται, ἅγια. R. Asting notes that the idea of holiness is not a neutral characteristic but a type of "spiritual substance" which pertains to those within the close family-relationship. Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum, Göttingen, 1930, p. 208; cf. O. Cullmann, Baptism in the N.T., op. cit., p. 53 n.2). It is the application of the Old Testament conception of the family implicated in the corporate personality of an archetypal member of that family.

² That is, the "love of the (Christian) brotherhood," the mutual love which unites the family of God. F.W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, Oxford, 1947, p. 84.

³ What F. Prat describes as an ontological opposition, occurring between complete substances not between component parts of the same substance. Op. cit., II, 55.

reality an intermediate position between the "Israel of God" and humanity at large; the New and the Old Israels are radical opposites since the Jews have renounced what should have been theirs by right (Rom. 11:17ff.). The Church, in the mind of Paul, has displaced the exclusiveness within the world which characterized national Israel. This division between the People of God and the remainder of humanity had its roots far back in the origins of Israel and its constitution as the peculiar heritage of Jehovah through the divine election and the covenant.¹ In Early Judaism this exclusivism became a religious principle. Paul and the writers of the New Testament in their conception of the Church, stand in a direct continuity with the idea of Israel as a unity set apart from the world.

But although Paul says much of the unity of the Church as an ideal entity, the final basis for the solidarity of the New Humanity is its unity with Christ Who incorporates it and identifies Himself with it as its realistic Representative. Says C.R. Smith with acumen: "None of the New Testament accounts of the perfect society link men with men immediately, but the direct connexion is with Christ and only through Him with other men."²

The Solidarity of the New Humanity as the Israel of God

Introduction

Shortly following the commissioning experience of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, the Church, then an infantile Jewish sect, was faced with the revolutionary idea of including Gentile converts. The champion for the inclusion of the Gentile converts, without insisting on their becoming Jewish proselytes, was Paul. Peter, on the other hand, was known as the Apostle of the

¹ Cf C.H. Dodd, Man in God's Design, op. cit., p. 17.

² The Bible Doctrine of Society, op. cit., p. 264.

Circumcision (Gal. 2:9). It was formerly assumed by scholarship in general that the immanent contradiction between these two groups denied the inherent unity of the universal Church. More recent opinion has stressed the transcendent unity of the Church which absorbed all of these apparently fundamental differences.¹ The singular mission of both apostles was to add to an already existing unity. Paul's continued interest in Jerusalem is the practical expression of his conception of this unity. He extends his concern for the brethren of Jerusalem among the Gentile churches by urging them to contribute to a fellowship fund for Judea.

On the more theoretical side, Paul has much to say on the fundamental character of the oneness of the Church. He does not turn aside to reflect on how noble the original intention of the formation of the sects within the Corinthian Church might have been; there is but one consideration - the cessation of schism (I Cor. 1:10ff.). It is the disunity of the Church of Corinth which evokes from Paul the striking teaching on the nature of the solidarity of the Church as well as his passionate exhortation to reassert the unity which is its fundamental characteristic. Yet, even in this First Epistle to the Corinthians it is plainly evident that neither his teaching nor his argument turns on certain benefits which either a group or the whole would secure from

¹ Note e.g., Jean-Louis Leuba, The New Testament Pattern trans. H. Knight, London, 1953, p. 125: "The institutional Church of Jewish Christianity and the spiritual Church of Gentile Christianity are the two pillars of New Testament ecclesiology. The Jewish Christian Church grouped around Jerusalem, its sacral center, forms at once the culmination of the Israel of the past and the point of departure of the new Israel. The Gentile Christian Church makes evident the discontinuity between the old and the new Israel. These two fundamental characteristics are the characteristic differences between the two Churches: the Jewish Christian Church develops according to the law of its immanent being, which is not other than the Spirit once given to it. The Gentile Christian Church springs up wherever among the Gentiles the Spirit evinces His sovereign grace and activity." See K.L. Schmidt, "The Church," Bible Key Words (T.W.N.T.), trans. J.R. Coates, London, 1950, pp. 13ff.; L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, op. cit., pp. 6ff.

achieving unity. Rather, for Paul, the unity of the Church is the manifestation of the transcendent solidarity which belongs to it by divine appointment. Unity belongs to the essential nature of the Church in lieu of its union and identification with the personality of the risen Christ. Paul's rhetorical question, "Is Christ divided?" (I Cor. 1:13) has no meaning apart from this presupposition.¹ S. Hanson observes this point accurately:

By the unity with Christ the Church itself becomes a unity. It appears from this that Paul's conception concerning the unity of the Church is not based upon practical Church-political interests, but to him the unity of the Church is ontologically motivated: it belongs to the very essence of the Church, to its structure. For the Church is conceived as a collective personality, as a person of unity.²

This idea is paramount in the Pauline conception of the Church as the New or True Israel. It is Christ Who fulfils in Himself the destiny of the People of God indicated by the varied Old Testament figures used to describe Him. In the roles of these corporate figures all telescoped in Paul's Christology, emerges Paul's doctrine of the Church as the People of God living in the New Aeon, "in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4) because it is embodied "in Christ Jesus" (vs. 11).

The Church as the Israel of God

1. Direct Evidence. - Using a unique phrase in the New Testament, Paul refers to the Christian community as the "Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16).³ But the idea

¹Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., pp. 74f. Note Augustine's comment on I Cor. 12:12: "He did not say, 'So also is Christ's,' meaning Christ's body, or Christ's members, but his words 'so likewise is Christ,' thus calling the one, Christ the (Church's) head and body" (The Anti-Pelagian works of St. Augustine, trans. P. Holmes, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1872, p. 61). Says K.L. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 16, "Christology and ecclesiology are obviously on the same footing" (cf. p. 21). Cf. Wm. Robinson, The Biblical Doctrine of the Church, St. Louis, 1948, pp. 70, 100.

²Op. cit., p. 85.

³G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, London, 1937, p. 192 and E. Burton, op. cit., p. 358, interpret this term as a reference to a faithful

underlying the term is by no means either unique or unusual, for Paul thought of the Church as the New Israel¹ having displaced the forfeited position of the Old Israel after the flesh (cf. Rom. 9:6,8). Therefore, Paul emphasizes the first person, "We are the circumcision which worship God in spirit, boasting in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh" (Phil. 3:3). The implied contrast of the New with the Old is clear in that the older dispensation, Israel after the flesh, by its rejection of the Messiah

the true People of God) (p. 150).
 remnant of God's people which although unenlightened are destined for salvation. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 2nd ed., London, 1943, p. 150 and J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, 10th ed., London, 1890, pp. 224 f. disagree, thinking that it is a reference to the Church. H.N. Riderbos, The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, Grand Rapids, 1953, p. 227, suggests that Paul's use of the term without further explanation reflects a traditional Jewish prayer in which there is a reference to us first and then to all Israel, thy people.

¹P.G.S. Hopwood cautions us not to allow the "New Israel theory" to destroy the vital oneness with Israel which the primitive Church possessed (The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church, Edinburgh, 1936, p. 231). This is quite true. Paul does not go further than the possibility of Israel's rejection (*ibid.*) but the opposition between the individual unbelieving Jew and the believing Gentile is absolute (cf. I Cor. 10:32; R.N. Flew, *op. cit.*, pp. 150f.). It is more than likely that Paul is thinking in terms of the "righteous remnant" concept. (This would require some modification of Lightfoot's assertion that in the New Testament interpretation of the Old, the spiritual takes the place of the natural; the Israel after the flesh becomes the Israel after the Spirit and therefore the Jewish nation, not the remnant, denotes the Christian Church, *op. cit.*, p. 143). On the other hand, W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, *op. cit.*, p. 200, points out that the remnant idea is not connected with the Church as a whole but with the meager company of believing Jews. Cf. G.S. Duncan, *op. cit.*, p. 192 (note the distinctions of groups of Jews within Israel in the Old Testament such as Elijah's Seven Thousand and Isaiah's Remnant, cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, London, 1920, p. 38). A.E.J. Rawlinson registers disagreement, expressing the opinion that the Church is the true, redeemed Israel, "the remnant according to the election of grace" (Rom. 11:5), into which the Gentiles are admitted ("Corpus Christi," in Mysterium Christi, *op. cit.*, p. 232; cf. G. Johnston, The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament, Cambridge, 1943, p. 77 n.3). The point is insignificant as long as one recognizes the continuity of the true People of God as they have been historically manifested in Israel and in the Church (cf. R.N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 151). The uniqueness of the Church lies in its manifestation in the New Age. Thus, it is the locus of the Reign of God promised in the prophets (R.N. Flew, *op. cit.*, pp. 24, 87).

whom the God of Israel had sent, "had shown clearly that it could not longer serve the purpose for which God had originally brought it into being."¹ There is a similar stress in the theme of Ephesians 2:11ff. where Paul discloses the purpose of God in calling the Gentiles. They had previously been aliens from Israel's citizenship, strangers to the covenants of promise (vs. 12; cf. 4:18); now however, they are no longer aliens and foreigners but fellow-citizens (συμπολίται) with the saints (i.e. Israel as the true People of God) (Eph. 2:19).²

Paul writes in the same vein to the Church in Rome. Using Hosea 2:23 as his text, the Apostle says: "Us whom also he called, not alone of the Jews but of the Gentiles, as also in Hosea it says, 'I will call them my people which were not my people and her which was unloved, beloved'" (cf. Hos. 2:1). The conclusion cannot be avoided that Paul is thinking of the Gentiles as now part of Israel, for the original context refers exclusively to Israel and Judah. Paul's application of Hosea 1:10 in Romans 9:26, "And it shall be that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, There shall they be called sons of the living God" (R.V.), is identical. The idea of the Church's displacement of the position of Israel is clear in Romans 2:28f., "For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly...But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly."

The Apostle goes even further to point out that descent from Abraham is not the exclusive possession of the Jew. The promise that the Patriarch would be the father of many nations (πολλῶν ἐθνῶν, i.e. the Gentiles) had been fulfilled

¹ W.N. Pittenger, His Body the Church, New York, 1945, p.2; cf. T.M. Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, London, 1902, pp. 34f.

² Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 142; H. Weinel, op. cit., p. 320.

in their acceptance of the Gospel (Rom. 4:11ff.; cf. Gal. 3:7). Paul does not hesitate to say that Abraham is the "father of us all" (Rom. 4:16) since it is in Isaac that his seed should be called (Rom. 9:7).¹ The true children of Abraham are those to whom the promise has become actual.² This conception is the premise of the argument in the allegory of Galatians 4:21ff. The children of Sarah (i.e. of the promise) inherit the New Jerusalem, the capital of the True Israel. The Jewish nation, in its bondage to the law are children of the slave, Hagar, and are content with an earthly Jerusalem as their capital.³

In the extended metaphor of the Olive Tree, Paul clarifies his conception of the relationship between the Old and the New Israel. He uses the analogy of a tree to define the continuity of the People of God, a continuity which transcends both temporal and racial factors.⁴ This continuum is represented by the root or trunk into which believing Gentiles are engrafted (Rom. 11:17ff.).⁵ Israel's rejection of the gospel in no way pronounces a final judgment upon the tree. It merely results in the breaking off of some of its branches

¹ Paul's argument is based on an obvious deduction from the Genesis account which mentions two sons as possible heirs. He concludes that birth alone cannot possibly determine the People of God as it would not have allowed the rejection of Ishmael. The promise is prior to considerations of birth (cf. Gen. 18:10) even as is the sovereign election of God (Rom. 9:10ff.). Cf. Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., pp. 238f. M.M. Bourke has cited some interesting passages in the Midrash (Gen. R. 53.12) commenting on Gen. 21:12). Apparently the Rabbis on occasion limited the seed of Abraham within the progeny of Isaac so that Esau might be excluded from the inheritance of the righteous. A Study of the Metaphor of the Olive Tree in Romans XI, Washington, 1947, p. 28 n.62.

²Cf. H. Weinel, op. cit., p. 320.

³Cf. E. Burton, Galatians, op. cit., p. 263.

⁴So M.M. Bourke, op. cit., pp. 82ff., 108ff. "The natural branches are his (Abraham's) physical descendants, the Jews; but they remain on the tree only when they practise that virtue which was the distinguishing mark of Abraham - faith" (ibid., p. 83).

⁵ἐγγεντρῖζω is a more technical word for grafting than σὺμφυτος (Rom. 6:5) used to describe our union with Christ.

(vs. 18; cf. vs. 25).¹ The whole continuum is the true Israel of God manifested in the Christian Ecclesia.² "Israel after the Spirit," says E. Lohmeyer, "is the goal and culmination of the former Israel after the flesh and both are joined in one God-given continuity."³ Paul's idea embraces the activity of God in Israel's redemptive history as a continuation and end of the original constitution of the People of God.⁴ It is into this continuity that the Gentile Christians have been incorporated and it is for this reason that Paul says that they are borne by the root (Rom. 11:18).⁵

It is on account of this sharing of Israel's privileged position that Paul speaks of the debt which the Gentile portion of the Church owes to the Jewish

¹There are interesting parallel Rabbinic opinions which maintain that Israel can deny its heritage. At the same time, the Rabbis were evidently aware that non-proselyte (i.e. Christian) Gentiles were included in the designation of the True Israel. It drew a violent reaction and condemnation. Cf. M.M. Bourke, op. cit., p. 19.

²Cf. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 77 n.3; B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, London, 1929, p. 47; R.N. Flew, op. cit., p. 151; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 327. There is no reason to doubt that this idea goes directly back to Jesus who by choosing and commissioning the Twelve, expressed His intention that the disciples should not break with the established national Israel. The figure "twelve" is not a mere approximation but was intended to constitute a deliberate link with the historic tribes of Israel (cf. Matt. 19:27ff.). J.-L. Leuba, op. cit., pp. 59f. See also the extensive treatment of this point by R.N. Flew, op. cit., pp. 35ff.

³Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie, Tübingen, 1929, p. 166. Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 323; C.H. Dodd, Man in God's Design, op. cit., p. 17, sees this continuity as a single community of Hebrew clan, Israelite Kingdom, Jewish Dispersion, and New Testament Church, in successive stages. One must not overlook the discrimination between Israel as a racial entity and as epitomized in the righteous remnant.

⁴Cf. E.H. Wahlstrom, op. cit., p. xiv; G.E. Wright, The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op. cit., pp. 77, 79. (Note the distinction between $\lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ and $\xi\theta\nu\eta$ in Acts 15:14). This does not mean that the election of Israel is nullified (cf. Rom. 11:26, 29) since the incorporation of the Gentiles is providential. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 78.

⁵To engraft the "wild branches" may be unnatural, but it is the means by which life (i.e. salvation) is extended to the Gentiles through the covenant of promise (cf. E.H. Wahlstrom, op. cit., pp. 78f.). Thus salvation is extended

segment, for the Gentiles "have been made partakers of their spiritual things" (Rom. 15:27). Any material contribution cannot compare with the spiritual benefits which accrue to the Gentiles through their being grafted into the stump of Israel.¹

2. Indirect Evidence. - Besides the more or less explicit reference to the Church as the Israel of the New Age, there are certain terms which indicate a conscious or unconscious conception of the continuity of the Church with the Covenant People of God. If they are unconsciously used by Paul it is due to the fact that he inherited these terms from the Christian community which preceded him and he had no mind to challenge them.

a. The Church as the Ecclesia of God. - The use of the term ἐκκλησία to designate the New Community points to its continuity with Israel.² P.G.S. Hopwood says quite categorically:

In adopting ecclesia or its Aramaic equivalent to denote itself, the primitive community showed that it was self-conscious as virtually belonging to the earlier 'ecclesia' of Israel, the Chosen People; it was aware of its social solidarity with the People of God.³

to the heathen in the identical manner in which it was offered in the Old Testament, namely, through incorporation into Israel (see further W. Manson, "The Biblical Doctrine of Mission," I.R.M., Vol. 42, July, 1953, pp. 261f.). It is on these grounds that M.M. Bourke's conclusion that the metaphor of the Olive Tree is simply another designation of the Body of Christ secures plausibility (cf. pp. vii, viii).

¹If a relationship can be traced between Paul's figure of the root (Rom. 11:16ff.) and Isaiah's prophecy of the root of Jesse which will bear a rod on a Branch (11:1, cf. Ps. 110:2), we may see more than an unconscious allusion to the remnant concept of the prophets. We encounter the theme of this general section. Christ (Isaiah's Messiah; cf. Is. 11 passim) is the organic connection between the Old Stump and the new branches (His co-heirs) engrafted into Israel, since He is the embodiment of the remnant (cf. G.A. Danell, "The Idea of God's People in the Bible," The Root of the Vine, op. cit., p. 36).

²C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., pp. 165f. Cf. N.A. Dahl, op. cit., pp. 181ff.; A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., pp. 103f.

³Op. cit., pp. 230f.

The adoption of this term by the Primitive Church may be presumed to have been influenced by the Septuagint which translates $\zeta\eta\rho$, "the congregation of Israel," with the term $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$.¹ The Hebrew term $\pi\tau\gamma$, also designates the general assembly of the whole people and is rendered indiscriminately as $\sigmaυναγωγή$ and infrequently with other more or less synonymous terms.² In Psalm 73:2 (74:2) the LXX renders $\pi\tau\gamma$ with $\sigmaυναγωγή$ but Paul changes this term to $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in an apparent allusion to this Psalm (Acts 20:28). This indicates that Paul goes beyond the Septuagint usage of $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ to translate $\zeta\eta\rho$ by rendering $\pi\tau\gamma$ as $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ also.³ In so far as a relationship is recognized between the New Testament usage of $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ to refer to the Church and the LXX translation of the terms $\zeta\eta\rho$ and $\pi\tau\gamma$, it seems plausible to affirm that the writers of the New Testament saw an equivalence between Israel and the

¹Cf. A.G. Hebert, The Throne of David, London, 1926, pp. 228, 233. occurs about 75 times in the LXX as recognized by E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint, Oxford, 1896 (K.L. Schmidt, op. cit., says about 100 times), and shows that it is always a translation of $\zeta\eta\rho$ or a derivative of that noun (cf. K.L. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 51). L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, Leiden, 1953, give as one of the meanings of the term $\zeta\eta\rho$, "die (jüdische) Kultgemeinde," (the Jewish congregation). Cf. B.D.B., op. cit., p. 874 for the usage of $\zeta\eta\rho$ to refer to the assembly and to the community. The whole argument gains force when it is recognized that Paul is what A. Deissmann calls "a Septuagint Jew." Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History, trans. W.E. Wilson, London, 1926, p. 99.

²Cf. T.A. Lacey, op. cit., p. 229. This writer is not precisely correct in affirming that $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ translates $\pi\tau\gamma$, since according to Hatch and Redpath, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 433, it never does. While $\sigmaυναγωγή$ is usually used to render $\pi\tau\gamma$, the fact that $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and $\sigmaυναγωγή$ are synonymous and that $\zeta\eta\rho$ and $\pi\tau\gamma$ are used more or less interchangeably (cf. Prov. 5:14, Judges 20:1, Joel 2:16) in the LXX, indicates that the idea of the Congregation and not merely the Hebrew idea of congregating lies behind the New Testament term $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$.

³In the later O.T. writings, $\pi\tau\gamma$ almost disappears while $\zeta\eta\rho$ increases in prominence (cf. H. Cremer, op. cit., pp. 330f.). $\sigmaυναγωγή$ in the Inter-testamental period and later came to refer almost exclusively to the Jewish place of worship.

Church.¹

To the Gentiles uninfluenced by the usage of the LXX, ἐκκλησία was a "thoroughly secular word,"² such as might designate a brotherhood, a political assembly, a club, or even a mob (Acts 19:32, 39, 41). The choice was a natural one for the Church, for it was familiar to the Greek world but no longer carried a close association with συναγωγή which would have confused Christianity with Judaism. At the same time, as K.L. Schmidt says, "this very word ἐκκλησία, with its natural worldly associations, voices the greatest claim of the Christian community over against the world."³ This was the universal appeal of Christianity to join the society of the Redeemed apart from any regard for considerations of race, position, sex, or creed. But the qualifying genitive "of God" (cf. e.g. Gal. 1:13) establishes its distinctive character far above that of a club.⁴ Thus, it is the "Society of God", at once different from the ἐκκλησία of Judaism, yet at the same time, the fulfilment of the election of Israel in its role as the "People of God." "The Christian doctrine of the Church arose out of the fundamental postulate that it was the true and ultimate people of God and heir of the divinely-guided history of Israel."⁵ According to T.A. Lacey, the very adoption of the word ἐκκλησία was paramount to the resounding

¹ Note that Stephen, in referring to Israel, says, "the Church (ἐκκλησία) in the wilderness" (Acts 7:38). Cf. K.L. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 5.

² K.L. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 4. Note Josephus' usage in Wars 4.255 (Loeb Cl. ed., III, 76).

³ Op. cit., p. 28.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 7, 11. This distinction comes directly from the Old Testament; although generally omitted it is always understood. So also in Philo, the religious connection is maintained through the addition of "of God" or "of the Lord" (cf. Leg. All. III.81, Loeb Cl. Lib. ed. I, 354; Ebr. 213, Loeb Cl. ed., III, 428). Cf. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 79 n.9.

⁵ C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, London, 1952, p. 111.

claim that the New Society asserted its continuity and identity with the old ecclesia of God.¹

b. The Church as οἱ ἅγιοι . - Of a comparable importance with the use of the term ἐκκλησία to designate the Church, is the reference to Christians as "the saints." Paul uses ἅγιοι and ἐκκλησία(ι) interchangeably² (II Cor. 1:1; cf. Rom. 1:7, I Cor. 6:1f., 14:33, 16:1, 15, Eph. 1:1, Phil. 1:1, Col. 1:2, 3:12 (ἐκκληστοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι) with I Cor. 1:2, Gal. 1:2, I Thess. 1:1, II Thess. 1:1).³ Since the Children of Israel were the "holy ones" in the Old Testament (cf. Deut. 14:2, Ex. 19:2 as well as the title in Dan. 7:18, 22),⁴ the term in the New Testament appears to be a conscious attempt to indicate the continuity between the "saints" of all time. The New Testament adds, however, to the idea of separation unto God, that of the actualization of holiness in the Redeemed through the activity of the Holy Spirit (II Thess. 2:13) in its contesting of the contemporary claim of Judaism that only Israel are "saints."⁵

¹Op. cit., p. 29. J.Y. Campbell denies that ἐκκλησία carried any suggestion that the Church was the New Israel, but his distinction between the Old Testament terms קָהָל and עֵדוּת is too precise. His claim that עֵדוּת must never mean more than "the Community in assembly" is not well substantiated. Note e.g. Prov. 5:14 LXX, "the assembly and congregation" indicating that they are used interchangeably. The argument that Paul would have used ἐκκλησία κυρίου (frequent in the LXX) and transferred it to Christ carries weight, but the argument from silence is not conclusive (see further K.L. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 51ff.). Campbell places too much emphasis on the classical usage and too little on the LXX. He overlooks the static character of ἐκκλησία in the LXX while emphasizing the historical progression of the change in meaning up to the first century. See J.Y. Campbell, "The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word ἐκκλησία," J.T.S., Vol. 49, 1948, pp. 130ff.

²But Paul refers to the holiness of the Church only once (Eph. 5:27), a reference which later became common-place. The use of ἅγιοι does not refer to a quality but is bound up with Paul's conception of justification. K.L. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 16, 22.

³Cf. N.A. Dahl, op. cit., p. 218.

⁴Cf. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 88; W.N. Pittenger, op. cit., pp. 37ff.

⁵The eschatological awareness of the Church that the Messianic Age had dawned is plain (cf. Ezek. 37:14). There is a well-made point in R.N. Flew, op. cit., pp. 102f., "If we lay all the stress on the continuity of the new community with the ancient People of God, it would seem incorrect to use the

Three basic ideas which first related to Israel as the "holy race" by derivation apply to the Church.¹ 1) The conception of Israel as holy by separation unto God and for His purposes is axiomatic in the Old Testament and Early Judaism. 2) In an eschatological sense, the "holy" are those who have been delivered from the rule of darkness and share in the Messianic age (an idea which receives ample treatment in Paul's Epistles, cf. e.g. I. Thess. 3:13). 3) There is finally the ethical sense in which it is implied that the Community will keep the commandments of God (cf. I. Thess. 4:3ff.). It is the continuity of the Church with the righteous remnant of the True Israel which forms the background of the passage in Colossians 1:12 where reference is made to the grace of God in making Gentiles partakers of the inheritance of the saints through their redemption from darkness into the kingdom (messianic) of Christ.

c. The Church as $\delta \lambda\alpha\delta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. - The designation of the Church by the term $\lambda\alpha\delta\varsigma$ indicates that it is in a continuity with the covenant people of God.² In the LXX, $\lambda\alpha\delta\varsigma$ is the term used to render לעם (more than 1500 times, cf. I Cor. 10:7) and is an explicit designation of Israel when it is qualified as ה'לך לעם ; לעם חסידים . In the Epistles, it is the Church of Corinth (II Cor. 6:16; cf. Lev. 26:12, Jer. 31:1, Ezek. 37:27) or Gentile believers in general which are called the "people of God" (Note that ὁ λαός μου $\lambda\alpha\delta\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon$ Rom. 9:25; cf. Hos. 2:25, 2:1, is equivalent to the designation of ethnic Israel as $\text{ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ}$ in Rom. 11:1, 2). In Romans 15:8ff., Paul declares that Christ became a minister of the Circumcision that

phrase New Israel at all. But the claim to be the true sons of the covenant, the legitimate heirs of the promises, is dominated by the conviction that the Messianic Age had already dawned and that the last days were at hand. It is this conviction which makes the idea of the new Israel inevitable. It was new because it was founded on a fresh act of revelation, inaugurating the final era."

¹See further, R.N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

²Cf. C.A.A. Scott, *The Fellowship of the Spirit*, London, 1921, pp. 75f.

the promises which God made to the Fathers might be fulfilled (cf. Gal. 4:4f.). These promises have been given explicit fulfilment in the call of the Gentiles and the confession of Christ among the heathen (cf. Ps. 18:49, II Sam. 22:50) so that they have been enabled to rejoice with God's people (Rom. 15:10). In the sacrificial offering of the blood of Christ, there has been provided a cleansing from all sin (*ἀνομίας*) and the purification of a people for his own possession (*ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον*, Tit. 2:14; cf. Deut. 14:2; Ex. 19:5).

d. The Church as οἱ ἐκλεκτοί. - In the Old Testament period, Israel was supremely conscious of its election by the free grace of God.¹ In the New Testament, the Church has displaced national Israel's position as "the elect" (οἱ ἐκλεκτοί²). Therefore, Paul speaks of Gentile Christians as ἐκλεκτοί (Rom. 8:33, Tit. 1:1; with the qualification of θεοῦ, Col. 3:12, II Tim. 2:10). The election of the Church, like the choosing of Israel, was founded on the sovereign decision of God which long antedated its actualization in the formation of the church of Ephesus (1:4), Thessalonica (II Thess. 2:13), or the Universal Church (II Tim. 1:9).

This election does not have individual emphasis in Paul, any more than it did for Israel of the Old Testament or the Early Jewish period. Rather, it implies a covenant-relationship through which God chooses for Himself a whole people. This collectivism is of supreme importance for the understanding of the

¹ Cf. N.H. Snaith, "Choose," T.W.B.B., *op. cit.*, p. 43. In the period of the Second Temple, such terms as "Chosen People," or "Elect of God," referred technically to Israel.

² This is the LXX rendering of *בְּחֵרָה* and *בְּחֵרָה* - note *בְּחֵרָה* said in reference to pious Israelites (Is. 65:9, 15, 23; Ps. 104: (105) 43; cf. Sap. 4:15) indicating a connection with the remnant concept.

implications of "election in Christ" even as K. Stendahl concludes:

...How meaningless Paul's agonized theodicy in Romans 9-11 would be, unless one could consider the question of the Jewish people as a whole apart from that of its individual members. What application would the ultimate salvation of all Israel have to S. Paul's Jewish contemporaries who died without knowledge of Christ? The collective entities S. Paul is considering occupy whole aeons; the Old Israel passes away, and out of it comes the Kingdom of God... Election in Christ not only constitutes a new society; its meaning is to be found in the new society, and not in the status of individuals.¹

In Paul's intricate argument recorded in Romans 9, he is not attempting to refute the notion of a corporate election, but the Jewish contention that this election was mediated only through the natural relationship of birth, thus identifying a man's pedigree with the election of God. It is just the opposite. God called Isaac (vvs. 7ff.) and loved Jacob (vs. 13) quite apart from their generic relationships. Election belongs to the secret purposes of God, before the individual is born or has done either good or evil (vs. 11). This is not, however, the whole story. God does recognize some relationship (a fundamental idea to the conception of a corporate election), for Isaac is chosen out of the descendants of Abraham and Israel out of Isaac's progeny.²

In this section, we must again recognize our theme, for Paul does not think of any election for the Gentiles outside of God's "Elect One," Jesus Christ. Paul asserts that it was "in Him" that "the elect ones" were chosen before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4; cf. I Cor. 1:27).³

¹"The Called and the Chosen," Root of the Vine, op. cit., p. 69.

²It is of interest in this connection that Paul did not break entirely with the Jewish conception of ancestral merit (note Rom. 9:5, 11:28).

³Note that in Luke Christ is "the Elect" (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλεκτός 9:35; οὗτος ἐκλεκτός 23:35). This is an oft-repeated designation of the Messiah in the Book of Enoch, chaps. 39ff. In Is. 42:1, "mine elect" is the designation of the מְשִׁיחַ. Twice the "Master of Justice" is called "Elect of God" and his followers are the "elect of God," in the Dead Sea Commentary on Habbakuk. Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 32.

e. The Church as the "Sons of God." - As Israel through election and the Covenant became the "son" of God (Ex. 4:22f., Hos. 11:1; cf. Deut. 14:1, "Ye are the children of the Lord your God...") and individual Israelites partook of that relationship, so Paul repeatedly refers to the membership of the Church as the "sons of God."¹ It is on the basis of the New Covenant that the Church has been given divine adoption (an idea exclusively Paul's²). The Apostle refers to the sonship under the law as identical with servanthood (Gal. 4:1ff.); a sonship "after the flesh" is contrasted with the sonship of promise (Gal. 4:22ff.). Through the Incarnation of the only-begotten Son and His implication in the human solidarity in its distance from God, the possibility of the adoption into divine sonship has been opened to us (Gal. 4:4f.). Apart from Christ, this adoption is not our privilege.³ It is the Spirit of the Son which issues to seal the relationship and to make the believer conscious of a filial relationship to the Father (Gal. 4:6, Rom. 8:15f.).⁴ Rather than exemption from the inheritance due to the firstborn, (a fate which the Judaizers were courting through their continued servant-relationship), the Community of believing Jews and Gentiles (Gal. 3:26) has been declared co-heirs with Him (Gal. 4:6, Rom. 8:17).⁵

¹ Note the promise attached to the giving of the New Covenant in Jer. 31:9. In direct contrast to a heathen or Hellenistic conception of divine sonship through generation from the gods, the Bible knows only of acquired sonship with the exception of the only-begotten Son. A. Deissmann notes that Paul uses the ancient idea of legal adoption current in the Hellenistic world of his day. Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History, trans. W.E. Wilson, London, 1926, pp. 174f.

²E.H. Wahlstrom, op. cit., p. 75.

³D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 45; cf. E.L. Mascall, Christ, the Christian and the Church, London, 1946, pp. 94f.

⁴Cf. W. Koester, Die Idee der Kirche beim Apostel Paulus, Münster i.w., 1928, p. 40.

⁵Cf. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life..., op. cit., p. 51. We may note a counterpart to this idea in the oscillation between Israel as the son of God and

Participation in the Son (I Cor. 1:9)¹ is aligned with the idea of the sonship of Abraham in the Epistle to the Galatians. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (3:29; cf. vs. 16). Both ideas were interchangeable in Paul's mind since Christ was both Israel and the Son of God. By incorporation into Christ, the New Israel became sons of God as well as sons of Abraham. The title "sons of God" is therefore, like "saints" a collective term which at the same time has special reference to the Church as the New Israel.²

f. The Total Extension of the Whole Church in the Local Assembly. -

One more point deserves some attention. In the New Testament usage, the Church is conceived in typical Hebrew terms of extension. Thus the local church(es) is thought of in an absolute sense when Paul exhorts the elders of Ephesus to "pasture the ἐκκλησίαν of God" (Acts 20:28; cf. vs. 17).³ The local church

the king of the elect people of God as pre-eminently worthy of this title in the Old Testament. Thus it is written of Solomon, "I will be his father and he shall be my son" (II Sam. 7:14).

¹κοινωνία retains its primary and common meaning "participation along with others in something" (J.Y. Campbell, "κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament," J.B.L., Vol. 51, 1932, p. 380. Cf. E.L. Mascall, op. cit., pp. 111, 144. Mascall holds a proper distinction between the three types of union to be found in the New Testament: 1) essential in the trinity, 2) hypostatic in the incarnation, 3) adoptive through incorporation into the manhood of Christ (op. cit., pp. 92f.). But note the views of Wm. Robinson, op. cit., p. 73 and T.F. Torrance, The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church in the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1954, pp. 10f.

²Cf. Wm. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 64f.

³This mode of expression is common as Acts 12:5, 15:4, 22 (of Jerusalem) and 11:26, 14:27, 15:3 (of Antioch) will show. Note the striking illustration in Acts 15 where the church (vs. 3) refers to the Christians of Antioch and in vs. 4 to the Christians of Jerusalem. It is particularly clear in Acts 9:31, ἡ... ἐκκλησία καθ' ὅλην τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας... (the plural is very poorly supported, occurring the Koine rescension and Beza as over against all of the better Mss. witnessing to the singular.

is neither a part or a fraction, but the whole Church locally embodied.¹

Says F.J. Hort to the point:

Of course in strictness the words belong only to the one universal Christian Ecclesia: but here (Acts 20:28) they are transferred to the individual Christian Ecclesia of Ephesus, which alone these elders were charged to shepherd. In the Epistles we shall find similar investment of parts of the universal Ecclesia with the high attributes of the whole... These attributes could not be ascribed to it as an absolutely independent and as it were insular society: they belong to it only as a representative member of the great whole.²

It is further true that the local Church is also used in the plural number to designate the different manifestations of the whole Church (I Thess.

2:14, Rom. 16:16)³ by Paul, even as he used the singular in an identical manner (cf. e.g. I Cor. 1:2; altogether about 90 times in the New Testament).

Besides the conception of the transcendent unity of the Church which this mode of expression indicates, there is a significant and precise parallel in the contemporary Jewish use of the term "synagogue" in referring either to Israel as a whole or to a local assembly of Jews. The many synagogues were never considered to be a denial of the inclusive unity of the one Synagogue constituted by the Covenant People of God.⁴ The identical manner in which the term ἐκκλησία was used in the New Testament may be significant in that the nature of the Church is assumed to be endowed with the distinctive attributes

¹R.H. Fuller, "Church," T.W.B.B., *op. cit.*, p. 48; cf. T. Schmidt, *Der Leib Christi*, Leipzig-Erlangen, 1919, p. 123; Wm. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 61. It is identical with the Semitic manner of thinking, *supra* p. 37f.

²*The Christian Ecclesia*, London, 1908, p. 103. K.L. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

³The use of the plural is no exception to the point contended. Says R.B. Rackham, "If there were many local churches, there was only one church in one place: we read of 'the churches of Syria and Cilicia,' not of 'the churches of Antioch'" (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 12th ed., London, 1939, p. 80).

⁴R.B. Rackham, *op. cit.*, p. 80. In the Old Testament LXX there is only one "synagogue" or "ecclesia" (see Hatch and Redpath, *op. cit.*, II, 1309f.) Even as late as I Macc. (cf. 3.44) and Susanna (cf. vvs. 41, 59f.) "synagogue" refers to the whole nation or a part.

of the Synagogue.

g. Conclusion. - As long as the Church is the New Israel, it is not surprising to find that it is characterized by the distinctive attributes of the Covenant People such as holiness, election, divine adoption, extension, and even the technical titles of Israel.

This self-consciousness of the Church, namely, that it is the True Israel, has very important implications. The significance of the conception for Paul will become increasingly apparent. But briefly, it is fundamental to recognize that the solidarity of Israel in both the Old Testament and post-Biblical periods may be safely ascribed to the Church.¹ The attributes of corporate personality, continuity, group kinship, transferable merit and punishment, realistic representation, vicarious substitution, etc., are thereby assumed to be applicable to the Church with the same rigor that they applied to Israel.

Elements in the Formulation of Paul's Doctrine of the Church as the New Israel

We must now proceed to consider the presuppositions by which Paul justified his doctrine of the Church as the New Israel completely apart from the elaborate initiation ritual required of Gentile proselytes to become Jews.² It was with rare insight that Paul cut the ties of the Christian Community to the very core of Judaism. Neither circumcision nor the Torah define the limits of the New Israel. The question turns on faith by which a man is identified with Christ. To describe this identification, Paul (in complete agreement with

¹Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 29; W.J. Hythian-Adams, The People and the Presence, Oxford, 1942, p. 200.

²On this subject, see the magnificent argument of L. Newbigin, The Household of God, London, 1953, Chap. II, 32ff. Cf. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 81.

the rest of the New Testament) uses certain Old Testament figures to represent Christ. Throughout this presentation, the Old Testament and Early Jewish conceptions of solidarity determine the Apostle's thought.

1. Jesus Christ is the "True Isaac." - We shall first consider Paul's unique interpretation of Genesis 13:15-17 and 17:8.¹ He affirms that the "seed" promised to Abraham was singular in reference and therefore represents Christ (Gal. 3:16). Now it is clear that the Early Church thought of Christ as epitomizing Israel,² but Paul goes further to assert that He is the Son of Abraham par excellence.³ But the "seed" of Abraham is not merely an individual but a corporate figure including in Himself all of the true sons of

¹T.A. Lacey mentions a similar interpretation of Gen. 4:25, pointed out by I. Abrahams who derived it from Wetstein (cf. T.A. Lacey, op. cit., pp. 236f.). "Another seed" was used by the Rabbis to refer to Ruth, progenitor of David, and consequently of the Messiah. In the Midrash Gen. R. 23.5 and 51.8, this "seed" is called the Messiah. Thus, in the comment on Gen. 19:32 ("that we may preserve seed of our father" where the seed is Moab, Gen. 19:37) the Midrash has: "It does not say in the text son, but seed; this is the seed that came from another place (the "another" of Gen. 4:25 is alluded to), and who is this? King Messiah." While C.H. Dodd calls it typical Rabbinic exegesis, Romans, op. cit., p. 79, it is best to see it as an interpretation (cf. M.M. Bourke, op. cit., pp. 32ff.). H.N. Riderbos, op. cit., p. 133, notes that there is a distinction between "seed and seed" implied in the Genesis passage.

²G.A.F. Knight, op. cit., p. 158. It is altogether natural that Matthew (2:15) applies Hosea 11:1 to Jesus as long as Christ is equivalent to Israel (G.A. Danell, "The Idea of God's People in the Bible," Root of the Vine, op. cit., p. 35). The original promise refers to the Land from which the Messiah was to come. Paul inter-relates the Messiah, Land, and blessings for the nations (i.e. Gentiles) in this interpretation of Genesis (cf. M.-J. Lagrange, Épître aux Romains, op. cit., p. 92; M.M. Bourke, op. cit., pp. 53ff.). Lightfoot notes that "even the rabbinical writers saw that 'in Christ' was the true seed of Abraham. In Him the race was summed up, as it were. In Him it fulfilled its purpose and became a blessing to the whole earth. Without Him its separate existence as a peculiar people had no meaning. Thus He was not only the representative, but the embodiment of the race." Galatians, op. cit., p. 143. Justin Martyr is very explicit: "Christ who is called Jesus is Israel" (see 122f., 134f. Cf. Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho, trans. A.L. Williams, London, 1930, p. 277 n.3).

³Cf. W.J. Phythian-Adams, The People and the Presence, op. cit., p. 187

Abraham even as Isaac had incorporated ethnic Israel in himself. It is only by virtue of Gentiles acquiring a kinship relationship to Christ Who is the Head of the new $\Pi \Gamma \Sigma \psi \chi$, that they are as a matter of fact given membership in Israel.¹¹

It is this corporate figure which Paul is referring to in the Epistle to the Galatians: "Ye are all one (^{et}is - man)² in Christ; and if ye are part of Christ, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. 3:28). Christ is here viewed as a corporate personality who includes in Himself all of the true sons of Abraham thus annulling the age-old cleavage between Jew and Gentile, slave and freeman, male and female.³ The contrast with the contemporary practices of proselyte initiation is self-evident.⁴ The True Israel is formed by incorporation into a person (i.e. the Body of Christ) not a community or society. In particular, Paul is applying the Old

¹Cf. G.A. Danell, op. cit., p. 35; M.M. Bourke, op. cit., pp. 56ff. Compare the Rabbinic pronouncement of the proselyte as a "son of Abraham" through initiation into Israel.

²That is, masculine not neuter. Cf. G.S. Duncaⁿ, Galatians, op. cit., p. 124.

³Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 70; N.A. Dahl, op. cit., p. 214; L.S. Thornton, The Common Life..., op. cit., p. 54; E. Burton, Galatians, op. cit., pp. 508ff., 181f. W.J. Phythian-Adams remarks, "We may call this the unity of the new Israel of God" (op. cit., p. 198). It is equivalent to the Hebraic use of Israel to refer to the ancestor in his progeny.

⁴While it is true that there was a preparation for the New Testament doctrine of the New Israel in the current policy of Gentile initiation into Judaism, the practices were designed primarily to produce the racial factors which the pagan lacked. This resulted in the very strong emphasis on circumcision, Israel's racial symbol. Paul's conflict with the Judaizers centered on the question whether Gentiles would be required to be circumcised to become Christians (Gal. 5:1ff.; cf. Acts 15). In Paul's contention that circumcision must play no part in Christian conversion (Gal. 5:6; I Cor. 7:18f.) he broke with the conception of a racial Israel even as he broke with the constitution of the New Israel under the Old Covenant. Rather, the Church is founded on the principle of faith (Rom. 3:30) which is the medium of identification with the new Covenant and making circumcision of the heart alone valid for the Christian (Rom. 2:28f., Col. 2:11). Cf. K. Barth, The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism, trans. E.A. Paine, London, 1954, pp. 43f.; L. Newbigin, op. cit., pp. 32ff.

Testament conception of realistic representation.¹ Through faith, Gentiles have identified themselves with Christ who acts as their representative, "that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentile through Jesus Christ" (Gal. 3:14; cf. vs. 8). This all-important truth had been revealed to Abraham and was sealed in a covenant more than four centuries before the revelation of the Mosaic Law making it obvious that the Torah could not possibly have any part in making Gentiles into Israelites (see the argument in Gal. 3:14ff.; vs. 8; Rom. 4:6ff.).² This is the basis for the remarkable passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians:

But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition³ between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace (2:13-15).⁴

The Gentiles, formerly aliens to the citizenship (*ἡ πολιτεία*) of Israel, and excluded from the covenants of promise (made to Abraham) are all made nigh; through Christ, a common citizenship with the saints (i.e. the faithful righteous down through history) and membership in the household of God, has been freely awarded (Eph. 2:12, 19).⁵ There are no longer Two Men, the

¹Cf. T. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 218ff.

²Cf. M.M. Bourke, op. cit., p. 38.

³An allusion to the wall separating the Court of the Gentiles from that of the Jews. A Gentile crossed this barrier at the risk of his life (cf. Josephus, Ant. xv.11.5, in Whiston's ed., The Works of Flavius Josephus, Edinburgh, N.D., p. 336). Cf. A.G. Hebert, The Throne of David, op. cit., for the engraved inscription barring all foreigners from the enclosure around the holy place.

⁴Racial, social and sexual distinctions are not erased but transcended in the unity of the Body of Christ. Ibid.

⁵Paul maintains vigorously the Old Testament idea that there is no salvation outside of Israel. See Wm. Manson, "The Biblical Doctrine of Mission," op. cit., pp. 261f.

privileged and the nonprivileged, but the One Man united in peace.¹ Hence, to be "in Christ" is equivalent to being in the New Israel. A.E.J. Rawlinson has stated it well:

The New Israel, according to the New Testament thought, is 'in Christ' as the Jews were in Abraham, or as mankind was in Adam. The Messiah, is at once an individual person - Jesus of Nazareth - and He is more: He is, as the representative and (as it were) the constitutive Person of the New Israel, potentially inclusive.²

2. Jesus Christ is the Messiah of the Eschatological Community. - We have already made more than one allusion to the Old Testament prophetic picture of the New Israel regathered under the Messiah and re-constituted through the New Covenant. In the post-Biblical writings, especially among the Apocalyptists, this eschatological Community was given a great deal of attention. It was the regathered Israel in the Age to Come under Messiah's benevolent rule which Jews in the first century were impatiently awaiting. In both the Old Testament and the Apocalyptic literature, the Messiah is not infrequently identified with this eschatological community just as Israel was included in the corporate personality of king David or Solomon in the infancy of the monarchy. Various figures were used to designate the Messiah in this corporate role. It is natural that the New Testament writers should use these same figures to describe Christ and His relationship to the Church, especially when Jesus by His teaching gave them explicit warranty. We must now look at the use which Paul made of these figures and what light they shed on his conception of the solidarity of the New Humanity with Christ.

a. Christ as the Rejected Stone. - One of the least complicated illustrations

¹Cf. J. Armitage Robinson, op. cit., p. 65.

²Op. cit., p. 235.

of the New Testament conception of an eschatological community is found in Psalm 118:22, "The stone which the builders refused is become the head of the corner." While the original intention of the figure may have been a designation of the People of God, in the New Testament it is unambiguously applied to Christ (I Pet. 2:4, 6ff., Acts 4:11, Mk. 12:10, Lk. 20:17). Paul alludes to this figure in referring to Christ as the "head of the corner" (Eph. 2:20). R.N. Flew grasps the thought of Paul when he says, "The Stone by itself has little meaning. If it is 'the head of the corner' there is contemplated a new house of Jacob (cf. Eph. 2:19ff.)."¹ Israel, reduced to the one Man, is built again in the corporate Temple (a figure which we shall discuss later).²

b. Jesus Christ as the Son of Man. - A much more complicated figure is that of the Son of Man. It is difficult to ascertain whether or not the figure of the Bar enash in Daniel (7:13ff) influenced the later Messianic conceptions of the apocalyptic literature.³ If the Son of Man in the Similitudes of Enoch is

¹Op. cit., p. 65.

²See C.H. Dodd's suggestive diagram, Romans, op. cit., p. 187.

³Cf. A. Fridrichsen, "Jesus, St. John, and St. Paul," The Root of the Vine, op. cit., p. 42. It is not specifically within the domain of this study to discuss the intention which Jesus had in applying the title of the Son of Man to Himself. T.W. Manson maintains that Jesus wished to convey a corporate connotation with the accompanying idea of a spiritual Remnant (cf. The Teaching of Jesus, op. cit., p. 227; The Servant Messiah, op. cit., pp. 73, 80f.). Matt. 11:18f. would appear to argue against this point. If Jesus adopted Daniel's Son of Man, there is J. Bowman ("The Background of the Term, 'Son of Man'," Ex. T., Vol. 59, 1948, pp. 283ff.) and M. Black ("The Son of Man in the Old Biblical Literature," Ex. T., Vol. 60, 1948, p. 11) to support the idea that originally the figure was corporate, i.e. the glorified Israel. Bowman however, doubts whether it carried the corporate connotation in Jesus' day (cf. op. cit., p. 285). C.R. Smith is probably near the truth in his conclusion that it implies Jesus' typical manhood. Because of this He may assume the role of the Head of a New Humanity (The Bible Doctrine of Society, op. cit., pp. 238f.; cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., p. 104; J.Y. Campbell, "The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man," J.T.S., Vol. 48, 1947, pp. 154f.). This new Society is not out of continuity with Israel, any more than was the figure of

related to that of Daniel, there is a significant development, for the figure of the saints of the Most High denotes the pre-existent Messiah.¹ Moreover, in Enoch (chaps. 45-48), the "congregation of the righteous," also called "the elect" and "the holy" appear together with the Elect, Righteous or Holy One, who is also the Son of Man.² In 4 Ezra (7:27-32), there is a reference to the Messiah, who dies and thereby brings about the expiration of all who breathe. Later he is raised together with those who are identified with him.³ In 4 Ezra (chap. 13), "the man" appears who is presumably the Bar enash of Daniel. C.C. Torrey argues that this figure is the Davidic Messiah⁴ and to be contrasted

the Son of Man in Daniel. J. Woods, The Old Testament in the Church, op. cit., p. 13, says, "Jesus is one with Israel...in a far fuller sense than Ezekiel the prophet, or Daniel's 'saints of the Most High.'"

¹Cf. C.H. Kraeling, op. cit., p. 137. But this point is contested from another angle. J.Y. Campbell ("The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man," op. cit., p. 149) and H.H. Rowley (The Relevance of the Apocalyptic, London, 1944, p. 29) maintain that the title "Son of Man" was not a Messianic designation prior to the adoption of this title by Jesus. W.F. Albright is just as certain that the title was identified with the Davidic Messiah before Christ with the result that it was recognized by the disciples (From Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd ed., Baltimore, 1946, pp. 290ff.).

²C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development, London, 1936, p. 143. R.H. Charles estimates the importance of I Enoch in the New Testament very highly (cf. A.P.^{O.T.}, op. cit., II, 163, 184f.). but C.H. Dodd (According to the Scriptures, London, 1952, p. 117) and G. Lindeskog ("The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," The Root of the Vine, op. cit., pp. 14f.) do not accept Enochian influence in Jesus' adoption of the title "Son of Man." R.N. Flew sees an entire transformation of both Daniel's figure and Enoch's Son of Man. Jesus is one who is offering forgiveness to sinners as He goes inevitably to the Cross but at the same time associates His followers with Himself (op. cit., p. 55).

³Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., p. 98. This mention of the dying Messiah is most interesting. If the Ethiopic translation (contrary to the Latin and Syrian versions, more likely subjected to Christian influence) is adopted, 7:29 reads "my servant my Messiah" rather than "my Son the Messiah" (cf. A.P.^{O.T.}, op. cit., II, 582). The inference is unavoidable that there is an allusion to the Songs of the Servant in Isaiah (cf. C.C. Torrey, "The Messiah Son of Ephraim," J.B.L., Vol. 66, 1947, p. 261).

⁴Ibid.; so also A. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 87.

with the Messiah b. Ephraim of chapter seven. Even if this evidence is not considered to be compelling, the figures of the Messiah (i.e. the Son of Man) and the Suffering Servant are found in close proximity to each other.¹

Nowhere in his extant Epistles, does Paul use the title "Son of Man."² But his familiarity with it (as well as its implications in terms of a Messianic community) is evident from a number of passages. Without the pretence of being exhaustive, we may note that judgment which the saints are given to exercise (Dan. 7:22)³ corresponds to the judgment of the world which Paul reminds the Corinthian Church they will exercise (6:2. Compare the irony of I Cor. 4:8 with Dan. 7:18). The reference to the "second Man who is from Heaven" appears to be a certain allusion to the Son of Man in Daniel 7:13.⁴ C.H. Dodd observes in regard to the "faithful saying" in II Timothy 2:11f.:

(It is) apparently from a confession of faith in the form of a hymn, expressing the ultimate Christian formulation of the meaning of the vision, in which the Son of Man is at once Christ Himself, and the Church as the 'the people of the Saints of the Most High;' 'If we endure, we shall also reign with him.'⁵

¹The same is true in II Baruch also (cf. C.C. Torrey, op. cit., pp. 263ff.). Wm. Manson has studied the points of comparison between the figures of the Davidic Messiah (cf. Eph. 1:20 with Ps. 110:1), the Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man which "however disparate in origin they may have been, have in the religious thought of Israel been conformed to the same type;...(they are) successive phases of the Messianic idea, which connected respectively with Israel as nation, Israel as Church, and Israel as final, perfected elect of the supernatural Reign of God" (Jesus the Messiah, op. cit., p. 174). For an excellent examination of recent thought on the Son of Man, see C.A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 73ff., and Appendix II, 323ff.

²A.M. Hunter suggests that it may be due to the rather barbarous nature of the Greek phrase $\delta \text{ υἱος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου}$ (Paul and His Predecessors, London, 1940, p. 107; cf. P. Wernle, op. cit., p. 54). There is an apparent hesitancy on the part of the Synoptic writers to use the title also. It is used only by Jesus himself or by one of the evangelists through gravitational proximity (cf. Wm. Manson, op. cit., p. 114).

³Cf. H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of the Apocalyptic, op. cit., pp. 27f.

⁴T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, op. cit., pp. 233f.

⁵According to the Scriptures, op. cit., p. 68.

A paragraph in Romans eight (vvs. 17-19) appears to correspond to the experience of the corporate figure in Daniel, in that suffering with Christ guarantees glorification together with him.¹ T.W. Manson contends that the suffering of Christ which Paul claims to "fill up" by his own persecution (Col. 1:24) reflects the suffering of the Son of Man in conjunction with the Saints. The sufferings of Christ overflow into the life of the believer (II Cor. 1:5, Phil. 3:10) and the marks of persecution are the marks of the Lord Jesus (Gal. 6:17).² Paul's descriptions of the Second Advent apparently reflect ideas found in Daniel; the saints are manifested with Jesus Christ in the Parousia (I Thess. 3:13; cf. 2:19, 4:13ff.).

If Paul actually sees the Church as the fulfilment of Daniel's corporate figure, an obvious link is closed between the Old Testament conception of the "righteous remnant" identified with the Messiah and the Church as the True Israel constituted through Christ. Thus, the saints which form the corporate personality of the Messiah before his death (i.e. of Jesus) are re-constituted after His resurrection as the re-incarnation of the personality of Christ, which is His Body.³

Besides this controversial figure in Daniel, the title "son of man" also appears in the Psalms in such a way as to attract the attention of the New Testament writers. He is the "hero" (possibly the king; see vs. 1) of Psalm 80,

¹The phrase ἀποδόσειν τῶν ὧν τοῦ θεοῦ (vs. 19) is reminiscent of the "appearance" of the Son of Man (ἐδεῶρουν ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο, LXX, Dan. 7:13).

²The Teaching of Jesus, *op. cit.*, p. 232; Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, *op. cit.*, pp. 126f.; L.S. Thornton, The Common Life..., p. 35. Albeit, the suffering is not expiatory in the sense in which Christ's is.

³Cf. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

apparently a collective figure¹ which stands for the People of God or maybe an individual such as the king who incorporates Israel through realistic representation. This "son of man" is also called "God's right-hand man" (vs. 17) who unites with himself the People of God in their oppression (vvs. 3ff.) only subsequently to be "strengthened" (vs. 17). Here, as in Daniel, the "son of man" is identified either with Israel as a whole² or with a remnant.

There is still another reference to a "son of man" in Psalm 8:4ff. which was equated with Christ in the New Testament. The original intention of the Psalmist was the extolling of the dignity of mankind.³ Both Paul and writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews equate this passage with Psalm 110:1 to describe the risen Lord. Philippians 2:9-11 (describing the exaltation of Jesus Who became Man) and Ephesians 1:20ff. (describing Christ's supreme position as Lord of the whole creation) clearly indicate their dependence on these passages in the Psalter.⁴

¹C.H. Dodd, The Old Testament in the New, London, 1952, p. 11; According to the Scriptures, op. cit., p. 101. If, and it is by no means certain, the fusion of the figures of the Son of Man and the Messiah was first made by Jesus, this may well have been the Old Testament passage to suggest it (cf. Mk. 14:61f.). Ibid., pp. 101f. The reference to the vine (Ps. 80:8ff.) may be the background of John 15:1ff. where Christ declares the vital character of the relationship between Master and Community.

²J. Bowman, op. cit., pp. 283f.

³"Son of man" is not an uncommon Semitic idiom. The idea of "son" implies the absorption of the qualities of the one to whom the son stands in filial relationship. From this it would appear that the title in the Psalms (possibly Ezekiel) refers to one who bears the nature of man; what Dalman calls the "son of the genus of man" (op. cit., p. 235) or "one of the human species" (G.A.F. Knight, op. cit., p. 167; cf. P. Wernle, op. cit., p. 53; G. Lindeskog, op. cit., p. 15).

⁴The reference to the subjection of all things under the feet of Christ (I Cor. 15:27) is a direct quotation of Ps. 8:7 (cf. also Eph. 1:22). The placing of all enemies under His feet (I Cor. 15:25) is an unmistakable allusion to Ps. 110:1. Hebrews 2:6ff. quotes Ps. 8 at length only to arrive at the same conclusion, i.e. that Jesus is the "son of man", that is, man. In both Hebrews

In applying the "son of man" described in Psalm 8 to Jesus Christ, the New Testament breaks with the conception of an exclusively Jewish Messiah. This "son of man" is mankind epitomized in the incarnation of Jesus Christ,¹ the "Man who is from heaven." Thus, it is strikingly apparent that the "son of man" concept (i.e. as a title) in the Old Testament provides the basis of the New Testament conception of Christ as the One who incorporates the True Israel in Himself and is at the same time one with mankind apart from racial or national distinctions.

In extended discussions of the New Testament conceptions of the "Son of Man" it has been fashionable to compare it with the Iranian "heavenly man."² While Jesus' self-designation appears to be totally unrelated since it places a future significance on the title almost entirely,³ in the Epistles of Paul, a number of striking parallels suggest a possible dependence on the Iranian myth. We may summarise some of these elements in Paul's Christology already pointed out by Wm. Manson:⁴ 1) Christ's pre-existence (cf. e.g. Phil. 2:6f.), 2) Christ's cosmological significance (cf. Col. 1:15ff.), 3) Christ's description as a victorious redeemer raised from death (cf. e.g. Eph. 1:20), 4) the reference to the Man who is from heaven (I Cor. 15:47),⁵ 5) Christ as the sole ground and

and Philippians death is the prior experience to exaltation nor is suffering far removed in I Cor. (cf. vs. 20) and Eph. (cf. vs. 20). Cf. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scripture, op. cit., p. 20.

¹ Cf. Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, op. cit., p. 187.

² C.H. Kraeling maintains that the title "Son of Man" is a conscious attempt to designate the "Anthropos" (op. cit., p. 144). See also E.O. James, "The Sources of Christian Ritual," The Labyrinth, op. cit., p. 252.

³ Wm. Manson, op. cit., p. 184.

⁴ Cf. op. cit., pp. 186, 189f.

⁵ It is important to note that the Man from heaven is also the Last Adam in I Cor. 15:45, 47. The fusion of the Heavenly Man with the Second Adam might support Kraeling's contention that Jewish Adam-speculation was influenced by

source of the spiritual life of the Christian.

On the other side of the ledger there are some differences which argue strongly for the Apostle's independence of this oriental mythology. 1) Paul does not describe the pre-existence of Christ as a man, but as the eternal Son of God (cf. Phil. 2:6, Col. 1:13ff.).¹ 2) Christ's cosmological significance, in contrast to the Anthropos, is related to creation, never determined ontologically (cf. Col. 1:16). Christ's exalted position as Christus Victor has been but recently awarded (Eph. 1:20ff., Phil. 2:9ff.). 3) The union of the Body with Christ is effected through an act of creation, rather than the infusion of a divine principle which re-awakens the whole race.² So great is the contrast that Wm. Manson considers it a possibility that Paul may be actually protesting the Iranian mystery (possibly in Jewish form) in his doctrine of Christ.³

Our conclusions have been presented as the discussion has progressed but in

the Iranian myth (cf. also S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 116). J.M. Creed is not impressed with this idea: "The Pauline doctrine of Christ as the Second Adam has nothing to do with the heavenly Man of the Apocalyptic or Philonic philosophy" (op. cit., p. 134; cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op. cit., p. 49). Contrast D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 51; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, op. cit., p. 271 following Reitzenstein, Poimandres, op. cit., pp. 109ff.

¹Christ is Man only by acquisition or incarnation, but not so originally.

²Even E.O. James affirms that "the Apostle...saw in Christ something more than the counterpart of the primeval ancestor. For the re-creation of mankind involved both incarnation and redemption in order that those who had borne the image of Adam might now be fashioned in the likeness of 'the second man of heaven'" (op. cit., pp. 252f.). In this regard R. Bultmann correctly notes that the failure of the History of Religions school lay in its failure to see that the mysticism of the New Testament is not absorption (in a medieval sense) but detachment from the world in an eschatological sphere. ("New Testament and Mythology," op. cit., p. 14).

³Op. cit., p. 189. Cf. J.M. Creed, op. cit., p. 134; J. Moffatt, I Corinthians, op. cit., pp. 187f.; A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., p. 167.

summary form we have sought to establish that Paul fuses the figures of the "Son of Man" in both Daniel and the Psalter to formulate his Christology. In this way, Christ is identified with the righteous remnant, the True Israel, while at the same time He is the typical man and mankind's realistic representative. This is the theme which we have already presented, namely, that Christ unites both Israel and the Gentiles in Himself, making of both one New Man.¹ The eschatological character of this revelation leads Paul to refer to it as the "mystery of this dispensation" (cf. Eph. chaps. 2f.).

c. Jesus Christ as the Servant of the Lord, = Two Old Testament figures remain for our consideration in Paul's doctrine of Christ identified with the eschatological community,² namely the Suffering Servant and Adam.³ These figures are inextricably inter-related with the picture of Christ as the Son of Man and the True Isaac to produce Paul's kaleidoscopic Messianic picture. In one passage (Philippians 2:6ff.) the figures of Adam, the Son of Man and the Servant of the Lord are inter-woven in a single configuration.⁴

¹ Cf. C.H. Dodd, Man in God's Design, op. cit., p. 18.

² C.H. Dodd sees a similar but more vague motif in Joel 2f. and Zechariah 9-14. parallel to the figures of the Son of Man and the Servant. There are important distinctions in that the humiliation of Israel in these passages is deserved, nor is there any vicarious substitution for the nation as there is in the Songs of the Servant (The Old Testament in the New, op. cit., pp. 12f.). In any case, the problem is outside of our domain since Paul makes little use of these passages.

³ The importance of Paul's conception of Christ as the Second Adam has made it necessary to treat his doctrine in a major section.

⁴ The fusion of the roles of the Son of Man and the Servant of the Lord is traceable directly to the teaching of Jesus (cf. R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, trans. F.V. Filson, B.L. Woolf, London, 1938, pp. 290, 293; G. Lindeskog, op. cit., p. 15 n.3; Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, op. cit., p. 117, questions this conclusion). We have already noted that first century Judaism did not see the Servant as a Messianic figure (cf. R.N. Flew, op. cit., p. 68). The two lines of Servant and Messiah, however, are brought together in the New Testament, meeting in Jesus of Nazareth (H.W. Robinson, The Cross of the Servant, op. cit., p. 39). On the other hand, there is at least one Midrash (on Ps. 2;

The great importance of the Servant of the Lord passages (Is. 40-53) is evident throughout the New Testament. It was the basis for the interpretation of the life and death of Christ and undoubtedly held an important place in the earliest instruction of Gentile converts (cf. Acts 8:28ff.). On these grounds it is not surprising that Paul apparently assumes that his audience knows the significance of this passage although there may be personal or apologetic reasons for his omission of any direct reference to Christ as the Servant.¹ Allusions to the Servant are plentiful however.

Philippians 2:6ff. is largely determined by the fourth Song of the Servant.² Some of the points of contact are: 1) the use of the term "servant" (vs. 7), 2) the humiliation of the Servant (cf. vs. 8 with Is. 53:8, "in his humiliation," LXX), 3) the Kenosis of the Servant (cf. vs. 7 with Is. 53:12, "he emptied his soul"),³ 4) the death of the Servant (cf. vs. 8 with Is. 53:10, 12), 5) the exaltation of the Servant (cf. vvs. 9ff. with Is.

see Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., Vol. III, 18f.) which fused the ideas of Son of God, Servant of Jehovah, and the Son of Man (cf. Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, op. cit., pp. 100f.). Beyond this, it is significant to note that the "Anointed" (i.e. the Messiah) of Daniel 9 is "cut off." C.C. Torrey argues plausibly that the frame of reference is eschatological (op. cit., pp. 270f.). Now if there is a connection between the "Anointed" of chap. 9 and the "Son of Man" in chap. 7, Daniel himself fuses the ideas of a Suffering Messiah (i.e. the Servant) and the triumphant Son of Man. O. Gullman admits that the Messiah occasionally bears the title of the Servant of the Lord but the universality of his representative suffering is never ascribed to the Messiah in early Judaism (Bapt. in the New Testament, op. cit., p. 19; See R. Otto, op. cit., pp. 250ff. and W.J. Pythian-Adams, The Fulness of Israel, Oxford, 1938, p. 182).

¹Cf. V. Taylor, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, London, 1940, pp. 95ff.

²Cf. T.H. Bindley, "Fresh Light Upon Philippians II.5-8," Expositor, Dec., 1923, pp. 443f.; E. Lohmeyer, Kyrios Jesus, Heidelberg, 1928, p. 36; C.A. Wood's careful analysis of the comparative terms, cognates and synonyms in Phil. 2:6ff. in their relation to Isaiah's Suffering Servant, op. cit., Table II, p. 321.

³Indicating that Paul has reference to the death of Christ not the incarnation. H.W. Robinson, The Cross of the Servant, op. cit., pp. 73f.

53:13, "he shall be high and greatly exalted."). Elsewhere in the Songs, as God is glorified in His Servant (Is. 49:3), Paul declares the establishment of the Lordship of Christ to be "unto the glory of God the Father" (vs. 11).

In Romans 4:25, Christ "who was delivered up for our transgressions..." (cf. Eph. 5:2, "even as Christ...gave himself up for us") is a definite allusion to the sacrifice of the Servant (Is. 53:5, 6, 12).¹ "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin,"² is a re-statement of the clause, "thou shalt make his soul a sin-offering" (Is. 53:10) and fits the spirit of the whole of the last Song.² The "peace" which Christ has been made for us (Eph. 2:14; cf. Rom. 5:1) may be a contraction of the "chastisement of our peace" which the Servant bears through his suffering (Is. 53:5). The direct quotation of Isaiah 52:15, "To whom no tidings of him came, they shall see; and they that have not heard shall understand" (Rom. 15:21), identifies Christ with the Servant. For this reason the report mentioned in Isaiah 53:1 is the gospel which Paul preaches (Rom. 10:16).³

Although Paul individualizes the figure of the Servant of the Lord just as the Songs of the Servant do, there is another side to the issue. He in no way emasculates the corporate character of the Old Testament figure but gives it new meaning in the identification of Christ with the Church. The conception oscillates between the individual and the collective in the mind of Paul so that he does not distinguish between the experience of the Servant and that of the Community which

¹Cf. V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 95.

²Cf. H.J. Schoeps, "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology," trans. R.H. Pfeiffer, J.B.L., Vol. 65, 1946, p. 391.

³Wm. Manson makes an interesting correlation between the function of the Servant in the role of "the light of the Gentiles" (Is. 42:6, 49:6) and Paul's designation of Christ as the Wisdom of God" to the world (I Cor. 1:24, 30). "Mission and Eschatology," I.R.M., Vol. 42, Oct. 1953, p. 393.

He incorporates. Thus, in Romans 8:33f., the justification or vindication accorded to the Servant (cf. Is. 50:8f.) is ascribed to the "elect," that is, the Church. In the next breath Paul asserts that this justification rests entirely on the merits of Jesus Christ who died and rose again to be exalted to the place of honor at God's right hand. It is as R. Otto says:

The result for the Servant of God became the same for those who cleaved to Him: 'With many will he divide his spoil' - a result which followed from the fact that they had part in the atoning power of suffering through which the Servant of God had sanctified himself. And this became the real point of Isa. liii.¹

The expanding and contracting figure of the Suffering Servant painted the ideal picture of Christ whom Paul saw as the Individual incorporating the Israel of God in Himself.²

There is still another aspect to Paul's identification of Christ with the Servant of Jehovah. It is his doctrine of the vicarious atonement of Christ for the New Israel. Just as the Servant stood in vicarious solidarity with Israel (emphasized repeatedly in Is. 53:4-12), Christ stands in vicarious union

¹Op. cit., p. 291. This quotation is somewhat ambiguous. Because the Servant is an individual He atones for Israel and the Gentiles through His vicarious substitution. To share in this atonement requires the identification of the sinner in the representative role of the Servant.

²The Old Testament principle of corporate personality which designated the Servant as at one time Israel and at another an individual is identical with Paul's interpretation of the promise to Abraham regarding the "seed" (Gal. 3:16). There is an interesting terminological coincidence in Is. 41:8 where the Servant is called "the seed of Abraham." While some scholars hold that Isaiah does not depict the Servant as an individual, we have contended on the basis of Is. 49:3-5 (see supra p. 63f.) that an individual reference is required (cf. G.A. Danell, op. cit., p. 33). In that case there is a fundamental difference between the Son of Man in Daniel (which is not actually an individual) and the Servant of the Lord. The individualization of the Son of Man does occur in I Enoch and 4 Ezra and of course the New Testament. But the Servant was originally an individual who standing in the place of Israel bore her mission. Yet at the same time he was Israel. In the hour of vicarious suffering he was reduced to one individual. In the New Testament, Jesus fulfils this role explicitly (cf. A.E.J. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 232) for He alone remains in the crucial hour. The disciples have fled (Matt. 14:50; Jn. 16:32); the Jews effect Jesus' death. In the slaying of its Messiah, national Israel (as a unit) rejected its role as the People of God (cf. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 117) and room is made for the regathering of the New Israel through incorporation into Christ.

with the True Israel.¹ Identically with the Old Testament idea of identification of the offerer with his vicarious substitute, Paul declares that he himself has been crucified with Christ (Gal. 2:20). The vicarious death of Christ was the corporate experience of the New Humanity as Paul declares: "...the love of Christ constrains us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died" (II Cor. 5:14). The way to forgiveness, life, and exaltation is through inclusion into Christ and through a realistic re-experiencing of His death and resurrection.²

More explicitly, for Paul, the death of Christ is sacrificial. This understanding is more determinative in his theology than it is in much of the rest of the New Testament with the exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews and I Peter.³ That Christ fulfilled the mission of the Servant of the Lord is important at this juncture. The Servant is explicitly described in terms of a sacrifice ('asham, "guilt offering" Is. 53:10).⁴ It follows that the death of Christ should be interpreted as an expiation for sin. This doctrine is so completely interpenetrated with ^{the} vicarious mission of the Suffering Servant and so fundamental to

¹Cf. Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp. 117f.; T.W. Manson, The Servant Messiah, op. cit., pp. 73f.

²Cf. G.A. Danell, op. cit., p. 36. Off the immediate subject but very much to the point, is Paul's declaration that Christ rose "on the third day according to the Scriptures" (I Cor. 15:3). There appears to be no alternative passage to which he could be referring besides Hos. 6:2 which refers in its original context to Israel (cf. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, op. cit., p. 103; The Old Testament in the New, op. cit., p. 21). If we assume that Paul has not broken completely away from the original intention of Hosea, we have another example of Paul describing Christ as incorporating the True Israel and raising them in His own resurrection.

³Cf. A.H. McNeile, New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's, Cambridge, 1923, pp. 233f.

⁴Cf. H.H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," op. cit., p. 104.

the whole of his theology,¹ that no detailed list of the points of correspondence can be made. II Corinthians 5:21 is very explicit: "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him." It is the sacrificial character of Christ's death which is presented to the Ephesians; "Even as Christ also loved you, and gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odor of a sweet smell" (5:2). The old sacrifices of the Temple ritual have been displaced by the one all inclusive sacrifice of the Lamb of God for the New Israel, even as the Servant in his death bore the sins of a defiled Israel (Is. 53:6).² As the death of the Suffering Servant was not limited to national Israel in its potential effectiveness, Paul posits the potential extension of the atonement of Christ to the whole cosmos (cf. Rom. 5:6, 8ff., 4:25).³ The references to "blood," "reconciliation" (Rom. 5:8ff.), "propitiation" or "expiation"⁴ (ἱλαστήριον, Rom. 3:25; cf. Eph. 2:13),

¹Contrast W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, op. cit., p. 30, who without an adequate reason maintains that the death of Christ is a fulfilment of Isaiah 53 in non-Pauline Christianity. That Paul did not make as much of the conception of the offering of Christ as a sacrifice (as some think he should have) is doubtless due to its fundamental character in his theology. He may well not dwell on this "first element" of the gospel because it was already familiar to his audience. In any case, in Paul's mind Christ fulfils so many varied roles, that it is usually the polemical, doctrinal, or ethical need of the moment that governed his emphases (cf. e.g. I. Cor. 5:7).

²At this point the evidence that the Last Song is cast in the familiar format of the imagery of the Day of Atonement is pertinent (cf. supra pp. 57f). Although the Maccabean period made explicit reference to ideas of vicarious human atonement, we are not convinced that Paul is primarily indebted to this extra-Biblical source for the background of his doctrine as H. Lietzmann affirms (cf. The Beginnings of Christianity, op. cit., pp. 116f.). A crucial distinction is noted in the universality of the vicarious atonement of the Servant which is missing from the prayers of the martyrs.

³Cf. C. Weizsäcker, op. cit., I, 160, who maintains that Paul's ideas on expiation are modified. If Christ became an expiatory sacrifice, that means merely that, by His sacrifice of Himself, a compensation was now made for God's previous forbearance with sin, that in accordance with essential justice, He might henceforth by this means impart righteousness to men (Rom. 3:25ff.). Cf. ibid., p. 161.

⁴On this point see V. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 219f.

arise directly out of the Jewish sacrificial system,¹ but Paul's explicit claim that Christ died for our sins "according to the Scriptures" (I Cor. 15:3), can scarcely be justified by any other Old Testament reference than Isaiah 53.²

H.J. Schoeps in a recent article has argued cogently that the doctrine of the expiatory sacrifice of Christ reflects the Jewish teaching on the "binding of Isaac," as it is interpreted in the familiar Rosh Hashana liturgy.³ There is something to be said for this contention, especially when we remember Paul's interpretation of the "seed" of Abraham as Christ who is, as a result, the real "Isaac" (Gal. 3:16). There are other correlative points: τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείρατο (Rom. 8:32) is to be compared advantageously with οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου (Gen. 22:16). ἡροέθετο in Romans 3:25, may well reflect Genesis 22:8, "God will provide himself a lamb." In contemporary Jewish thought broad merits were believed to have issued from the "Binding" to the advantage of all Israel.⁴ The emphasis which the Rabbis placed on the voluntary submission of Isaac has its counterpart in the voluntary self-sacrifice of Jesus (cf. Rom. 5:7).⁵ But Isaac

¹A. Schweitzer's favoring of Lüdemann's hypothesis which explains Paul's doctrine of redemption as an application of a physical nature-process is deficient at this point. Cf. Paul and His Interpreters, op. cit., p. 237.

²Cf. Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, op. cit., p. 124. This involves the two factors which C.H. Dodd has pointed out: "...Jesus is the 'Servant' who incorporates in himself the whole people of God, his death and resurrection, therefore being theirs, but 2) as such it is an 'offering for sin.' In its offering, sin is exhausted as to its penalty and expiated as to its consequent guilt." According to the Scriptures, op. cit., pp. 123f. The representative character of an expiatory sacrifice is fundamental to the whole idea of atonement as C.H. Dodd goes on to show, ibid., p. 124.

³Op. cit., pp. 385ff.

⁴Cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op. cit., p. 91.

⁵Cf. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, op. cit., pp. 118f.

is no more than the type (he was not actually sacrificed) of the real "Isaac" whose vicarious death provides a full redemption for the New Israel.¹

The Apostle's designation of Christ as "our Passover" (I Cor. 5:7)² gains an added significance from this same area of Jewish thought. It was the blood of the Passover lamb when applied to the doorposts of Israelites in Egypt, which derived its efficacy from the "binding of Isaac."³ This has its counterpart in Paul's reference to the "redemption ($\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, a term of deep religious significance for a Jew, as "redemption" was the mighty act of God which constituted Israel as a nation) through his blood" (Eph. 1:7; cf. Rom. 3:24, I Cor. 1:30, Col. 1:14). In Rom. 5:9, Paul writes of "justification (a word containing greater ethical significance) in his blood." In Paul's re-application of the elements which were fundamental to the history of the Jewish nation, the redemption from Egypt only finds its true significance in the redemption from the thralldom of sin. Calvary is the juncture of the "passing over" of the New Israel incorporated in Christ from the Aeon of sin and death to the New Age of life and peace (cf. Rom. 5:17).⁴

In the eschatological interpretation of the death of Christ as the true sacrifice, it contrasts radically with the unreal and unprofitable sacrifices still

¹ Cf. H.J. Schoeps, op. cit., p. 392.

² This mention of the Passover sacrifice of Christ in complete independence of the Eucharist institution has caused a considerable amount of controversy. Was the Last Supper a Passover celebration at all (as J. Jeremias, Die Abendmahlsworte Jesus, concludes it must be) or is it a kiddush or haburah meal (as H. Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl followed by R. Otto, op. cit., p. 278, contends; so also, G.D. Kilpatrick, "The Last Supper," Ex. T., Vol. 64, 1952, 1953, pp. 6f.)? The point is complicated by various considerations which are beyond our domain. It is important for us to note here that Paul does explicitly refer to Christ as the fulfilment of the sacrifice of the Passover lamb.

³ H.J. Schoeps, op. cit., p. 391. Cf. Mek. I, 57; Ex. R. 17.3.

⁴ Cf. A. Nygren, Romans, op. cit., p. 228.

carried on in the Jewish ritual.¹ In the death of Christ which was the anti-type of the sacrifice prefigured by Isaac, Paul saw the fulfilment of the original intention of the historical event on Mt Moriah as well as the prophetic picture of the atoning Servant.

Rudolph Otto, after accepting the proposition that Jesus interpreted His death in the light of the corporate experience of the Servant of the Lord,² adds the significant point that the Servant was "the covenant" for the People of Israel. "I will make you into a berith (a diatheke, a covenant) with the people of Israel" (Is. 42:6), that is, into a mediator of the covenant between me and the people. And likewise in Is. 49:8: "I will preserve thee and give thee for a covenant of the people."³ Paul makes reference to this "new covenant" in I Corinthians, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood (11:25). It is impossible to be certain that Paul has the Servant passages in mind from his form of the Eucharist, but the sacrificial nature of Christ's death as the seal of the "covenant" is clear.⁴ This is further shown in chapter 10:18ff., where the "cup" of the Lord is placed in direct contrast with the pagan sacrifices offered

¹ A.G. Hebert, The Throne of David, op. cit., p. 204. The idea of Christ's death as abolishing the temple-sacrificial ritual is firmly established in the Synoptic Tradition (Matt. 26:61, 27:40; cf. Jn. 2:19). The destruction of the Temple is implied in the offering of Christ's final and unique sacrifice (Heb. 9:26).

² Op. cit., pp. 250ff.

³ Ibid., pp. 289ff.; cf. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, op. cit., p. 142.

⁴ For a discussion of the problem of the sacrificial nature of Eucharist in its original institution, see Wm. Manson, op. cit., pp. 134ff. For Paul's allusions to the New Covenant of Jeremiah (which is doubtless the same as that which the Servant mediates), see C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, op. cit., p. 45. It may be added that the Servant and the idea of a covenant could scarcely be identified otherwise than at the point of his offering as a sacrifice, even as Jesus was the sin-offering and the covenant bond of the New Community in the thought of the New Testament (cf. ibid., p. 124).

to Gentile deities.¹

The Old Covenant was the foundation of the psychic bond which united Israel, transcending the distinctions between individuals and the vertical distinctions between generations; it made Israel specifically the People of God. The identical features were extended to the New Israel through the New Covenant mediated by Jesus Christ.² The nucleus of the Church as an eschatological community of Jesus' disciples were joined in the Last Supper in an unseparable bond with Christ.³ In the undissected Event of the communal meal and the

¹In the Old Testament, there is more than a passing relationship between a covenant and the sacrifice which seals it. God's covenant with Abraham was divinely sealed through the sacrifice which God accepted (Gen. 15:9-21). God's relationship with the Children of Israel was given its official sanction at the foot of Mt Sinai through the "blood of the covenant" (Ex. 24:8). These are the Old Testament counterparts to the blood-seal of the New Covenant (cf. G. Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 78; R.N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 72; Wm. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 145; A.E.J. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, p. 241).

In Paul's contrast between the two covenants in Gal. 4:24ff., the feature of sacrifice is omitted. But it must not have been far from his mind, since the free sons of the promise were accorded their blessed position only by the death of Christ, as Eph. 2:12f. specifically declares. In another context, Paul and his associates, through their missionary endeavors among the Gentiles, are the "ministers of the New Covenant" (II Cor. 3:6); they announce the message of reconciliation to all men apart from the consideration of ethnic distinctions (II Cor. 5:18ff.). The Apostle's reference to the New Covenant in Romans 11:27 is somewhat confusing. Here a quotation of Isaiah's prophecy touching the New Covenant (59:20f.; cf. 27:9; Jer. 31:31ff.) is applied to national Israel. This raises the difficult question whether Paul oscillates between the fulfilment of the prediction of the New Covenant in, 1) national Israel and, 2) in the calling out of the New Israel. While the former is assured, the latter is less certain, there being no direct quotation from the Old Testament which would unequivocally support it. One encounters the same problem in interpreting Peter's sermon in Acts 2:14ff. (see R.N. Flew, *op. cit.*, pp. 100ff.).

²Cf. J. Bright, *op. cit.*, p. 228f. Note that the sect which produced the Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls were "covenanters;" their name was "New Covenant" (cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *op. cit.*, p. 33).

³Cf. R.N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 65. As long as the Supper and the Crucifixion are regarded as a single "event" all subsequent partaking of the "cup of the covenant" is a memorial, a symbolic recollection of the original transaction. This seems to be Paul's intention in quoting the words of Jesus, "...this do ye, as oft as ye drink of it, in remembrance of me" (I Cor. 11:25).

crucifixion a new covenantal relationship with God was secured with positive features distinguishing it from the old: "First then was inwardness: 'I will put my law in their inward part'; second, individualism: 'all shall know me'; third, forgiveness of sin: 'their sins will I remember no more.'"¹ In the same transaction, each member of the new community was conjoined in community with the whole,² but of this we shall have more to say later. In fine, "...by the connection of this covenant with His atoning death, ...He gives His disciples a share in that reconciling power,"³ and establishes a real, visible community (in which the Gentiles are given an option) known as the People of God.⁴ Our theme has been repeatedly mentioned in the course of the discussion. In applying it to his doctrine of the Church, Paul needed little originality for the mission of the Servant involved those outside ethnic Israel. "I will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house" (Is. 42:6f.).

d. Jesus Christ as the High Priest of the New Israel. - Paul gives very little emphasis to the priestly role of Christ in contrast to the Letter to the Hebrews. Nevertheless, the idea apparently does not lie far beneath the surface of his thinking.⁵ One of the reasons for his omission may be his conception of the

¹R.N. Flew, op. cit., p. 73.

²Cf. C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, op. cit., p. 187; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 33.

³R.N. Flew, op. cit., p. 65.

⁴Cf. A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p. 85.

⁵Cf. St. Augustine, Ep. ad Anatolium, 4, "Our Priest took from us what He offered for us: He took flesh from us; and in this flesh He was made a victim, He was made a holocaust, He was made a sacrifice."

fusion of the roles of the officiating priest and the sacrificial victim. Far from there being any opposition between these two functions, Christ brings to fruition the Old Testament conception of the solidarity of the sacrifice and the one who offers it.¹ In Paul's doctrine Christ offers Himself (cf. Eph. 5:2, quoted above), a feat which the High-priest could do only symbolically. In I Timothy 2:5f. Paul refers to Christ as the Mediator² between God and men, serving as a ransom (ἀντίλυτρον)³ for all. Titus 2:14 adds to this mediation, the conception of a redeemed community which is a peculiar people (cf. Ezek. 37:23) gaining through solidarity with its self-sacrificed Savior, the benefits of redemption and cleansing from iniquity.

The probable background of the image of Christ as the Mediator is the impressive ritual of the Day of Atonement. A first principle of Judaism was that neither the individual Israelite nor the Community could gain access to God without the High Priest as a "go-between."⁴ This dogma is heightened in the New Testament doctrine of access into the divine presence. "In Christ," who is God's Mediator, both the individual Christian and the Church find ready access to a personal relationship with God.⁵

¹Cf. E.L. Mascall, op. cit., p. 75.

²It is by no means certain that μεσίτης in this passage means a priest. In Gal. 3:19f. the "mediator" is clearly designated as Moses, indicating a covenantal concept rather than a priestly function. The same idea is found in Heb. 8:6, 9:15, 12:24, where Christ is repeatedly the Mediator of the New Covenant, contrasting with the covenant proffered by angels (cf. Gal. 3:19). In Hebrews this is quite natural, for the writer sees Christ as the fulfilment of the priesthood of Melchizedek (cf. 8:1ff.).

³A derivative of λύτρον, (cf. Tit. 2:14) denoting the idea of the manumission of slaves. The Old Testament background is the emancipation of Israel from Egyptian bondage.

⁴The sinlessness of Christ (emphasized in Rom. 8:3; II Cor. 5:21) may be an antithetical reference to the embarrassing requirement of the High Priest to offer a sacrifice of atonement for himself on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:11), although of course there are other reasons (cf. D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 37).

⁵In strict accord with Hebrew thought he (Paul) has nowhere spoken of a

There is an important transition in Paul's thought in Ephesians 5:26f. It is no longer Christ as an individual¹ who is the sacrifice (contrast vs. 25, "even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it"), but as the Priest who offers His Body (the Church) to Himself (not however, a sin or guilt offering). There is a fusion of the roles of priest, victim, and deity, fulfilled in Christ. The Church is implicated in the holiness of Christ since it is identified with His sacrifice which has rendered it without blemish. Colossians 1:22 is more concise in its presentation of the idea of Christ's death as a reconciling sacrifice which makes the Church presentable to God.²

The theme of Christ as the realistic representative of the sinful community is the theme of the New Israel. Christ comes from the seed of Abraham (Rom. 9:5) from which the priests of God must come; nevertheless, in His identification with all flesh,³ Israel's repeated Day of Atonement was given a universal fulfilment. Gentiles and Jews are included together in an offering made once ($\xi\phi\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\ \xi$, cf. Heb. 9:26, 28, I Pet. 3:18) for all sins in the "end of the ages."

direct fellowship with God: 'relationship to God, in the Old Testament, was established through the altar (10:18);' St. Paul represents it as mediated through Christ." G.V. Jourdan, "Κολυμβία in I Corinthians 10:16," J.B.L., Vol. 67, 1948, p. 113 (cf. Hauck, T.W.N.T., Vol. III, 804).

¹The context is characterized by the idea of the Church as the Body of Christ, meaning that both Christ and the Body are one.

²Rom. 12:1 is different. The individualization of the sacrifice does not apparently involve the priesthood of Christ. It is Paul as the representative of Christ who offers the Gentiles as an immaterial sacrifice to God (cf. C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op. cit., pp. 195f.).

³Cf. M.J. Sheeben, The Mysteries of Christianity, trans. C. Vollert, London, 1946, p. 438.

The Solidarity of the Church as the New Humanity

Introduction

We must now turn to Paul's doctrine of the Church as the New Humanity through its identification with the Last Adam. This designation of Christ is supremely important for his doctrine of the Church and is all the more remarkable for its uniqueness.¹ As we have already considered, the use of the historical figure of Adam as a type of Christ is both comparative and antithetical.² In this respect, the doctrine of the Last Adam belongs to the same category as the figures which we have already discussed for it is the Church united with its Head as an eschatological community which is indicated by the idea of the New Humanity created through the Second Adam.³ More explicitly, the ideas of the aeons and their

¹ Cf. E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, The Riddle of the New Testament, London, 1931, p. 192. The challenge to the uniqueness of this expression formerly sustained on the basis of the occurrence of the same expression in Neve Shalom (bk. 9.8), has been conclusively rejected due to the fact that the book was composed in the 15th century. The Rabbis, it is true, spoke of the "first Adam," but only to distinguish the first man from later men (cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op. cit., pp. 42f.). G.F. Moore states categorically that there is no evidence that contemporary Judaism used any such term as "the last, the second or the coming Adam," to designate the Messiah ("The Last Adam," J.B.L., Vol. 16, 1897, pp. 158f.). A more convincing argument has been lodged by A.M. Hunter following Lohmeyer's (Kyrios Jesus, Heidelberg, 1928) contention that Phil. 2:6ff. is a poem or hymn composed in Greek by one whose mother-tongue was Aramaic which had the Second Adam as its theme (cf. A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, London, 1940, p. 46; M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, op. cit., p. 225 n.4). W.D. Davies correctly challenges the necessity of the contention that the hymn is pre-Pauline (op. cit., p. 42; cf. C.A. Wood, op. cit., p. 106). Although the first and the last man appear together for the first time in the writing of Paul, the casual introduction of the figure suggests that he is not presenting a new theologoumenon but is appealing to a traditional teaching (H. Lietzmann, an die Römer, (H.B.z.N.T.), 3 Auf., Tübingen, 1928, p. 63; C.H. Kraeling, op. cit., p. 161).

² Cf. J. Jeremias, T.W.N.T., op. cit., Vol. I, 141f.; A. Nygren, Romans, op. cit., pp. 218f.

³ This is true for more reasons than merely the idea that the New Israel has been manifested in the New Age. It is because as J. Weiss has said: "In his (Paul's) way of thinking, there lies the presupposition that the events of the primitive times - only in a reverse sense - must be repeated at the end of time, a conviction which elsewhere plays a great role in Apocalyptic" (op. cit., p. 434). Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 49.

respective heads find their contrasting parallels in Christ and Adam. The one brought sin and death; the other brought the converse; righteousness and life.¹

While it is altogether impossible to ascertain from what source, if any, Paul might have arrived at his remarkable doctrine of the Second Adam, it is more than a remote possibility that Rabbinic ideas found in the Adam-speculation regarding the creation of the first Adam (cf. supra pp. 142ff.) might have supplied some pregnant ideas.² The Apostle was fully convinced that the advent of Christ, the Messiah, marked the dawning of the New Age. While the Old Aeon had been subjected to the thralldom of sin and death in the service of the Prince of the powers of the air through Adam, Paul concluded that in the redemption of Christ from these powers that a new race had been brought into existence. From this it is readily seen that the conception of Christ as the Last Adam³ is in reality a cryptic summary of Paul's Christology, Soteriology, and Ecclesiology. In his

¹Cf. F.C. Baur, Paul, op. cit., pp. 215f.; K. Barth, Romans, op. cit., p. 164.

²It is interesting to compare the Jewish speculation of the glory of the original man with the impression of the vision of the risen Christ (cf. Acts. 9:3f., 21:6ff., 26:12ff., I Cor. 15:8ff.), but it is unnecessary to see more than a terminological connection.

The problems of sources and influence is both difficult and not particularly profitable. Assurance of any conclusion is always definitely limited by the evidence. Throughout, the question of priority must be kept in the foreground. For example, if the idea of the Church as a "new creation" (II Cor. 5:17) is the original conception, then it is natural that Christ should be seen as the head of the same even as Adam was the head of the old creation. On the other hand, maybe the self-determined obedience of Christ (note the Jewish ideas on the "binding" of Isaac) is the fundamental idea. In that case the contrast lies between the obedience of Christ in death and the disobedience of Adam. To say that Paul went outside of his own thought for his doctrines must be confirmed by the most convincing relationships and arguments. Otherwise Pauline studies will continue in the endless discussions which have so often ruled the day and will continue to deserve the charges of futility which A. Schweitzer has heaped upon them in his book, Paul and His Interpreters.

³Considering the fact of Christ's pre-existence Paul might have designated Him as the First Adam. But it was in the incarnation that Christ became man and thus acquired His archetypal position (cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., p. 167).

doctrine are to be found the principles of solidarity which we have already seen characterize the relationship of Adam to humanity as a whole: 1) realistic representation, 2) common nature and life, 3) cosmic implications. Besides these we must examine the doctrine of the Body of Christ and its relationship to the Adam-Christ typology.

Christ in the Role of the Last Adam

1. The Representative Role of the Last Adam. - D. Somerville has cited an opinion expressed by Nösgen¹ that Paul's designation of Christ as the Second Adam denotes Soteriological rather than Christological truth.² Although the statement is too extravagant, the Soteriological aspects are more clear and less subject to misrepresentation. In Paul, Christ is indeed the Author of Salvation, but this title is not given to Him in the same way in which a Gnostic might have described it.³ Nor does it have kinship with the myth of the Urmensch or a salvation offered by the Mysteries in which through emanation or union with a deity the cosmos finds redemption. The Incarnation of Christ has no benefits for the race apart from the determining act of obedience which stands over against the determinative transgression of Adam.⁴

¹Christus der Menschen und Gottessohn, pp. 110-115.

²D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 52 n.1; cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 53. M. Dibelius has gone too far in asserting that, "The faith of the early Christians was centered not in what Christ was, but rather what He had done for mankind. The New Testament contains practically nothing about the person of Jesus Christ in his ontological significance, nothing apart from his relations with mankind" (Gospel Criticism and Christology, London, 1935, p. 86).

³Christ is a universal cosmic principle rather than one of salvation for Gnosticism (F.C. Baur, The Church History to the First Three Centuries, Vol. I, trans. by A. Menzies, London, 1878, p. 198. This author goes on to conclude that Paul's theology contains "suggestions and germs of such a conception of Christianity.").

⁴Many fathers of the Church speak of the sanctification of human flesh

The antithetical parallel between Adam's disobedience and the archetypal Act of Christ is specifically drawn in Romans 5:18f.:

So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life. For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous. (R.V.)

As all men were included in the corporate judgment of Adam for the one act of transgression, so all men (doubtless relative in its scope) share in the free gift which is the reward of the one act of righteousness. As the first act of disobedience brought mankind into the slavery of sin (*ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεσάθησαν*) the positive act of obedience wrought by the Second Adam has rendered all the members of the New Race righteous.¹ The enmity between man and God instituted through the first man (cf. Rom. 8:7) has been abolished in the reconciliation of the New Humanity with the Creator (II Cor. 5:18ff.). The first sin was judged by the infliction of the death penalty on Adam and his race; the righteous deed has brought in its wake the prospect of eternal life, confirmed through the resurrection of Christ which all who are in Christ will share (I Cor. 15:22f.). Throughout the contrasting parallel there is a corresponding

through Christ's presence and contact (cf. e.g. Ambrose, *De. incar. sacram.*, 6.54, 56 and *De. fide*, 5.8.105 (*Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, trans. H. de Romestin, Vol. X, Oxford and New York, 1896, p. 297); see further F. Prat, *op. cit.*, II, 446). Says E.L. Mascall on this same point, "In Him considered in abstraction from his relation to the men and women whom he came to redeem, the re-creation of human nature is altogether complete, and if redemption consisted only in the appearance upon the earth of a perfect human being there would be no need for either crucifixion or resurrection" (*op. cit.*, p. 69; cf. M. Goguel, *op. cit.*, p. 248). Cf. L. Newbigin, *op. cit.*, pp. 112f.

¹R.N. Flew notes that McLeod Campbell (*The Nature of the Atonement*, 1856, chap. v.) "more than eighty years ago, insisted that the great key-word on the subject of the Atonement was the text, 'Lo, I come to do thy will, O God'. Discussions of recent^{time} with regard to the eschatological nature of the Kingdom of God enable us to set this motive of obedience against the background of God's final purpose for mankind" (*Jesus and His Church*, *op. cit.*, p. 69).

identification of the "many" (i.e. the Church) with Christ to the identification of the "many" (i.e. the cosmos of men) with Adam.¹ Both acts are crucial for the races which Adam and Christ represent since although the incidents are historical they have an eternal significance co-extensive with the aeons which they have founded.²

The frame of reference in which the Pauline doctrine of the transferred merit of Christ is cast, is familiar from the Old Testament and Early Jewish conceptions of solidarity. It is no more than the re-application of the conception of corporate personality which conceived of the guilt or blessing of the one involving the group in his own representative acts. As strange and mysterious as this type of thought is to us, it is increasingly clear that many commonly encountered interpretations of Paul's doctrine of atonement are quite beside the point. Any theory which stresses the "forensic"³ or a purely insular substitution is as inadequate to support Paul's doctrine of atonement as it is to explain his teaching on the implications of Adam's transgression for the race. Such explanations suffer from the lack of realism and subjectivity in their attitudes toward the solidarity which was basic in the Jewish background of Paul. It is only because one is "in Christ," implying a very real sense of solidarity, that any benefits accrue to the Christian. There is nothing here which can be construed as a mechanical transfer of merit.⁴

¹Cf. F.R. Tennant, S.D.F.O.S., op. cit., p. 262.

²Cf. A.S. Peake, The Quintessence of Paulinism, op. cit., p. 27.

³C.H. Dodd does use the term "forensic" in connection with II Cor. 5:21; but, his writing generally does not emphasize the legal or objective character of solidarity to the exclusion of the subjective and realistic (cf. The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., pp. 95f., 110).

⁴Cf. D. Somerville, op. cit., pp. 93f.

2. The New Humanity Implicated in the Nature of the Last Adam. - Because Christ stands in the same relationship to the New Humanity as Adam did to his,¹ not only was the archetypal act of obedience corporately rewarded, but the nature of Christ is shared by the Church. In contrast to man's subjection to the powers of the Old Aeon - sin, death, spirit-forces, all active in the flesh, the new character common to the New Humanity is described in terms of life, righteousness, and the partaking of the Holy Spirit, active in the Body of Christ.

For this reason to be "in Christ" is for Paul a formula expressing the solidarity between Christ and the Community members. It carries the assurance of "life" in the present (Eph. 2:1ff. cf. Rom. 6:5ff., Gal. 3:27)² and for the future³ (I Cor. 15:22, 50ff., I Thess. 4:13ff.). It is in this vein that Paul declares the purpose and grace of God to have been manifested in Jesus Christ, "who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (II Tim. 1:10).

In Christ, the believer has also been made the "righteousness of God" ($\delta\iota\kappaαιοσύνη \thetaεοῦ$, II Cor. 5:21; cf. Rom. 1:17; Phil. 3:9). This phrase is more emphatic than the expected adjectival description, "made righteous" ($\delta\iota\kappaαιωθέντες$ Rom. 5:1, 9; cf. 3:24, 28, Gal. 2:17, 3:24, I Cor. 4:4, 6:11, etc.).⁴ The determining characteristic of the Adamic race - sin - has

¹This has been well stated by S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 69, "To an Adam-collectivity corresponds a Christ-collectivity which, it is true, has an entirely different character, but is anyhow conceived according to the same pattern as the former." Cf. P. Feine, op. cit., p. 194.

²That is, in the sense of being the converse of "living death" (cf. supra 213) meaning reconciliation with God.

³Cf. O. Pleiderer, Paulinism, op. cit., I, pp. 18ff., for an excellent discussion of the two-fold aspect of the

⁴Cf. A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p. 131. See H.St.Jn. Thackeray, op. cit.,

been displaced in the New Race through solidarity with its righteous Head. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus; for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:1) exults the Apostle. This is the "gracious gift" which "superabounds" in its displacement of the banal influence of Adam's sin on the nature of the race.¹

In Christ, the believer is made a partaker of the Holy Spirit (πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν, I Cor. 12:13), the determinative personal force of the New Age.² He corresponds very clearly to Satan and his activity in the

pp. 80ff., for parallels and contrasts to the conception of righteousness in Judaism. This writer's suggestion that we look beyond the Jewish teaching of the zachuth aboth to the Old Testament where righteousness is depicted as a power which goes forth and propagates itself among men (cf. Ps. 24:5, Is. 56:1, 46:13, 51:5f.) is significant. Righteousness in these passages is personalized and stands as a possible counterpart to Paul's doctrine of sin (cf. supra, chap. 3). Thackeray lays too much emphasis on the forensic attitude of Paul toward righteousness.

¹Cf. A. Nygren, Romans, op. cit., p. 221; H. Lietzmann, an die Römer, op. cit., p. 63. This doctrine must have caused Paul some concern for he was obliged to explain the continued sinning of Christians. The Epistles do not give a complete solution to this problem. There is no doubt that Paul considered it an anomaly for a Christian to continue in sin as Rom. chap. 6 unmistakably teaches. A plausible suggestion is that Paul saw a contrast between those who were "in Adam" and those who were "in Christ" at this point also. As the "Adamite" is conditioned by sin and involved in the original transgression yet may nevertheless commit righteous actions which are contrary to his nature, so the Christian is conditioned by righteousness as well as involved in the archetypal act of righteousness, that is, the death of Christ. While it is possible for one to act contrary to the character which determines his race, one cannot receive the character of the New Humanity without becoming a member of the same through solidarity with Christ. Corresponding to what we have said is a point made by N.H. Snaith, "We do not deny that Paul uses the noun δικαιοσύνη in an ethical sense, for anything that is of God must necessarily have such a meaning as a part of its content. Paul actually used the word in a double sense, sometimes in a truly ethical sense, and sometimes in the full sense of salvation, exactly in both respects as the Hebrew tsedaqah is used in the Old Testament." Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London, 1944, p. 168.

²Note the interesting point that Gen. R. 8:1 (cf. Mid. Teh. on Ps. 139:5) identifies the Spirit of God "moving upon the face of the waters" with the "spirit of Adam" and the "spirit of the Messiah." Cf. H.L. Ginsberg, "Adam Kadmon," J.E. Vol. I, 181. The parallel is difficult to assess.

old Aeon. According to the Gospels, Jesus taught that the giving of the Holy Spirit would be effected only subsequently to the resurrection (Jn. 7:39; Lk. 12:12, Jn. 14:26ff.). Paul's doctrine of the Holy Spirit is also elaborated in a close relationship to the resurrection through which Christ, the Last Adam, became a "life-giving Spirit" (I Cor. 15:45). The apparent identification of Christ with the Holy Spirit, although not absolute,¹ is close enough for Paul to say, "the Lord is the Spirit" (II Cor. 3:17). Thus, in the Prison Epistles, "the omission of 'Spirit' is made up for by Head, which includes the idea of Spirit and has the advantage of combining both Immanence and Transcendence as Spirit and Lord do individually."² For this reason, the main point is seen in I Corinthians 12:12ff. if one recognizes that because Christians have the Holy Spirit, they are united in a connection with Christ "which may be compared to the relation of the body to the spirit."³ In the Hebrew mind such a relationship is indivisible - the body being the outward manifestation of the spirit or soul.⁴

What Paul is saying in referring to Christ as becoming a life-giving Spirit,

For one thing, the Midrash doesn't absolutely identify the two "spirits". Kraeling notes also that Paul speaks of the Spirit of Christ and the pneumatic Christ as well as the Spirit which man receives and the new, spiritual man, using the two designations almost interchangeably (cf. op. cit., p. 178). It is no more than a proximity of a later Rabbinic opinion to the thought of Paul.

¹Cf. J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, op. cit., p. 156. Contrast J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 356; C. Weizsäcker, op. cit., I, 145; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, op. cit., p. 120. G. Johnston has better fathomed Paul's enigma: "God is the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ; God's Spirit therefore is Christ's Spirit" (op. cit., p. 99).

²D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 168. This interpretation has definite limits.

³R. Asting, op. cit., p. 211; cf. F.A. Christie, "One Body in Christ, Rom. 12, I Cor. 12," J.B.L., Vol. 16, 1897, p. 128.

⁴H.A.A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, op. cit., p. 148.

is that there is now a new order of life in existence. The manifestation of this resurrection life is made effective through the working of the Holy Spirit who represents Christ on earth (cf. Rom. 8:2, 9:11). Jesus, following His resurrection, lives in His followers through the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:11). "For on account of having received the Spirit, man comes into a new, inner communion with Christ, so that Christ fills and rules him completely. Who is joined to the Lord is one spirit with him (I Cor. 6:17; Eph. 2:18)."¹ This forms the antithesis to Adam who lives on in the extension of physical life throughout the human tree. For Paul, such life is no more than death by comparison with the life of the new order.² Thus it comes that as Adam includes the Old Aeon within his corporate personality, the Holy Spirit incorporates the New Race, for the Spirit is one with the New Aeon.³

The Apostle bolsters his argument for the common spiritual nature of the "resurrection body"⁴ by using the analogy of the "firstfruits."⁵ That which characterizes the dedicated portion cannot be essentially different from the whole. Christ is the First-fruits of those that sleep, who are Christians (I Cor. 15:20). "And what applies to the First, the Head, also applies to

¹R. Asting, op. cit., p. 192; cf. p. 215; C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of St. Paul for Today, pp. 134f.

²This corresponds to ideas made very explicit in the Fourth Gospel. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit" (12:24, R.V.). In the discourse in the Upper Room, there is an emphatic declaration of the necessity that Jesus "go away" that the Holy Spirit might come (cf. e.g. 16:7). It is the Paraclete that extends the personality of Jesus after His ascent to the Father which is equivalent to the presence of Jesus Himself on earth (15:26, 16:14ff.; cf. Matt. 28:20).

³S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 96; cf. T. Soiron, Die Kirche als der Leib Christi, Düsseldorf, 1951, p. 181.

⁴On the corporate connotations of the "resurrection body" see J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., chap. 3, pp. 49ff.

⁵Cf. Ex. R. 31:9 (A. Feldman, op. cit., p. 71) where Israel or the Fathers are the firstfruits of the world.

all the following, the rest of the race. To Paul, this is an absolutely conclusive proof¹ (cf. Rom. 11:16). But such a proof has no meaning apart from the solidarity which characterizes the Community with its Author.² Such a solidarity involves the sharing in the heavenly nature of the living Christ (I Cor. 15:46ff.).³ With a view toward the future, Paul speaks of Christ as bearing the image of the heavenly and the incorruptible as the First from the resurrection; but, the same lies in store for the Community (I Cor. 15:49). The Apostle does himself look forward to the reception of the newly fashioned body conformed to the body of His glory (Phil. 3:21).

By virtue of His position as "firstborn (πρωτότοκος) from the dead," Christ has been accorded the Headship of the new creation which is His Body (i.e. the New Humanity) (Col. 1:18). To be "in Him" means to share in the supra-mundane type of life which is His; it means that one becomes a participant in the "new creation" (II Cor. 5:17).⁴

¹S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 99. Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., p. 98. This corresponds to what C.H. Dodd refers to as the indivisibility of "history and post-history" in the writers of the Old Testament (The Old Testament in the New, op. cit., pp. 18f.).

²This is unmistakable in Rom. 11:16 where the first fruits is originally a part of the lump (terumah) just as the root and the branches are related to each other. They must partake of the same nature (cf. Matt. 7:17ff.).

³On this subject, we may note a point made by J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 72: "'There is one body, and one Spirit' (Eph. 4:4). It is this Spirit which professor Cullmann has described as 'the anticipation of the end in the present' (Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 72) - which enables those who are in the Body of Christ to participate already, in this age in the resurrection mode of existence." This cannot mean that the resurrection has no further meaning for the individual Christian as Hymenaeus and Philetus evidently taught (II Tim. 2:17f.). As one shares in the common Spirit, he partakes of the nature of the New Aeon. At the same time, he is involved in the Old Age making this existence one of tension and anticipation of the final redemption in the occupation of the resurrection body (Rom. 8:23f., II Cor. 5:1ff., Phil. 1:20ff., II Tim. 1:12). Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., p. 95; F.A. Christie, op. cit., p. 123; L. Newbigin, op. cit., pp. 111ff.

⁴Cf. W. Grossouw, op. cit., p. 94.

The assurance that the New Humanity in fact does share in the common nature of the risen Christ is provided through the common possession of the Holy Spirit.¹ He is the seal (σφραγίς) of the salvation of the believer, a downpayment (ἀρραβών) on the inheritance of eternal life (Eph. 1:13f., 4:30, II Cor. 1:22, 5:5). This seal of the Holy Spirit makes the hope of the resurrection and the final vindication of the promise of the gospel absolutely certain. It is not wishful thinking, but absolute hope which saves us (Rom. 8:23f.), a hope which the fruit borne in us by the Spirit confirms (Gal. 5:22; cf. Eph. 5:9).

Paul uses the term "New Man" to designate his conception of the new Christ-collectivity and its characteristic nature. In antithesis to the Old Man which denoted the Adamic humanity and its defiled nature, the New Humanity has been re-created through solidarity with Christ, the Second Adam.² The character which mankind received from its ancestral source brought in its wake the disruption and divisions which plague the race.³ In each mention^{of} the "New Man" in Paul's Epistles, these divisions are declared abolished in the unity of the New Man which is the incorporation of the personality of Christ (cf. Col. 3:10ff., Eph. 2:15ff., 4:24, Gal. 3:28⁴).⁵

¹Cf. A. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 119; W. Beyschlag, op. cit., II, 87.

²See W. Law, The Spirit of Prayer, quoted in D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 111 n.1.

³This conception receives sustained emphasis in S. Hanson, op. cit., passim.

⁴Note that some ancient manuscripts (P46, X*, A) have ἐστε χριστοὶ for εἰς ἐστε ἐν χριστῷ. If the former reading is correct, this passage must be removed from the list of those which contain the idea of the "New Man." The sense would be simply, you are united because you belong to the common Lord.

⁵Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., pp. 144f., 80, 119; A.G. Hebert, op. cit., p. 235; T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, op. cit., pp. 233f. Paul's doctrines of the New Israel and the New Humanity coincide in the conception of

The passage in Colossians joins to the idea of abolished boundaries, that of the new nature which characterizes the New Humanity. There is a connection with Adam suggested by the phrase, "after the image of him who created him" (vs. 10). Adam, who was originally made in the image of the Creator, through sinning, lost any resemblance to the Holy God. By "putting on the new man" the Colossians are already renewed in the image of Him (i.e. God) who created him (i.e. Christ) (vs. 10, Eph. 2:15).¹ As Christ being the Son and image of God (cf. Phil. 2:6;² Col. 1:15), incorporates in Himself the New Humanity, they are as a unit restored to the glory of the original creation of Adam. From a human standpoint, it is the corporate Society which by ensphering itself in Christ produces the extension of the personality of Christ upon the earth. This is the representation of the character of God, for it reflects the image of Christ.³

Paul's doctrine of Christ as the Last Adam shows a studied attempt to show that Christ more than counteracts all the influence and consequences of Adam's solidarity with the human race in the New Humanity. In the place of death comes the influx of the new life of the Spirit which flows from Christ

the "New Man". The mystery of the New Israel, that is, the provision for the inclusion of the Gentiles, is integrally related to the description of the constitution of the New Humanity into the "New Man" (cf. G.V. Florovsky, "Sobornost," The Church of God, ed. E.L. Mascall, London, 1934, pp. 54f.).

¹Cf. C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op. cit., pp. 261ff.

²See E. Lohmeyer, Kyrios Jesus, op. cit., pp. 8ff., 18ff. who notes that μωπηλ may be translated as "demoutha" in Syriac, meaning image. The Peshitta uses "denoutha" in translating Phil. 2:6 (cf. A.M. Hunter, op. cit., p. 49).

³See further D. Somerville's excellent discussion of this idea, op. cit., pp. 127ff., 160ff.; cf. C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., p. 262. Says K. Barth pointedly, "Believers are therefore, in their fullgrown and no way attenuated individuality, one body, one individual in Christ. They are not a mass of individuals, not even a corporation, a personified society, or a 'totality', but the Individual, the One, the New Man" (Romans, op. cit., p. 443).

(Col. 3:4). As F.A. Christie says, "The Spirit in us is for Paul more than an ethical reality. The new life is new existence, new being, as well as a new character."¹ In the place of determination by the power of sin active in the flesh, comes the new nature characterized by righteousness. In brief, the original creation of mankind in the image of God has been restored in the New Humanity through its new relationship to Christ. Therefore, Paul does not hesitate to affirm that the corporate body of the redeemed forms a "New Creation" or a "New Creature" (II Cor. 5:17).²

The Last Adam and the Body of Christ

We must turn to examine the nature of the solidarity by which the New Humanity is united with Christ. We have spoken of a common sharing in the resurrection life of Christ through the Holy Spirit and of Christ's realistic representation of the Community. We have found fault with those views which describe the relationship of Christ to the Church as forensic and unrealistic. In the interpretation of the Body of Christ concept where the conception of Paul regarding the solidarity of the Christ-collectivity finds its most explicit expression, an opposite extreme is equally objectionable.³ Thus

¹Op. cit., p. 123.

²H. Lietzmann gives us a good summary: εἰ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, κοινῇ κτίσις. τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινὰ II Cor. 5:17 vgl Gal. 6:15: d.h. "die Kontinuität zwischen dem alten und dem neuen Menschen ist abgerissen"...: der neue Mensch ist frei und hat neue sittliche Qualitäten, die auf ihm verliehenen göttlichen πνεῦμα, einer empirisch wahr-nehmbaren Grösse, beruhen. Dies πνεῦμα gibt ihm die Kraft, Gottes Willen (Rom. 12:2, das Gesetz Christi Gal. 6:2, I Cor. 9:21) zu erfüllen (Gal. 5:22ff.) und vermittelt ihm die ζωή: beides sind ebenso korrespondierende Begriffe wie ἁμαρτία und Θάνατος (Gal. 6:8). An die Römer, op. cit., p. 66. Cf. E.L. Mascall, op. cit., pp. 77f.

³Roman Catholic interpreters are often open to this charge. Thus, T. Soiron assumes that the unity between Adam and humanity is biological (op. cit., pp. 85f., 91). By analogy (a doubtful interpretation of the Adam-collectivity) Christ and the Christian are a biological-spiritual Community (Ibid., pp. 86, 91). Other Catholic writers interpret the Body of Christ with varying forms of realism.

A. Schweitzer explains Paul's conception of the nature of the Body as a quasi-physical solidarity with the risen Christ.¹ J.A.T. Robinson also follows this line of thought too far in his chapter on the "Body of the Resurrection."² It is quite true that Paul teaches that a common corporeity on the human family level sanctifies (ἁγιασμοῦ) the unbelieving partner in the Christian community as well as making the children of the mixed pair holy (ἁγιάζω, I Cor. 7:12ff.), but does not make them members of the Body of Christ; otherwise, Paul would not continue: "For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O husband, whether thou shalt save thy wife" (vs. 16). In this passage Paul's emphasis is made not apart from the question of faith (cf. vs. 12-14); "holy" can refer only to a position of privilege guaranteed by the solidarity of the family, an idea which is thoroughly Hebraic. In fine, we must reaffirm a point emphatically made by E. Brunner:

It seems to me that recently people have been talking at cross purposes about the question whether the Body of Christ is meant as a metaphor or literally. Doubtless something literally true is meant thereby, as Thornton emphasized (The Common Life in the Body of Christ, p. 256) but equally certainly this real Body of Christ is not a physical organism, but rather this reality is compared with a physical organism (Eph. 4:12f.). Eduard Schweitzer is of the same opinion in The Life of the Lord in the Community and its Ministries, p. 51. When Rawlinson in Mysterium Christi speaks of being literally incorporated in the Body of Christ, that doubtless corresponds to the New Testament idea of baptism (cf. above p. 80) but does not therefore cease to be a figurative expression, because the Body is not composed of physical members but of persons called members.³

¹The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., pp. 116ff.; cf. p. 127. Schweitzer thus speaks of a "corporeity (Leiblichkeit) which is common to Christ and the Elect" (pp. 118, 121). It is too physical as A. Raymond George, Communion with God, London, 1953, p. 159, correctly observes.

²Op. cit., pp. 49ff.

³The Misunderstanding of the Church, Philadelphia, 1953, pp. 123f.; cf. p. 49; F.W. Dillistone, The Word of God and the People of God, op. cit., p. 54; F.J. Sheen, "The Mystical Body of Christ," Ecclesiastical Review, Vol. 3, 1935, p. 228; C.C.J. Webb, op. cit., pp. 230f.

1. The Problem of the Source of the Body-concept. - W.D. Davies has made a most significant contribution to the understanding of the nature of the solidarity of the Body of Christ by relating the conception to the Rabbinic Adam-speculation.¹ We may briefly notice that there are some parallels which appear to be more than coincidental. 1) As the original man was created from the dust of all the earth and filled all the space between earth and heaven, so the Body of Christ is not confined to one single location but incorporates all of the redeemed and vitally joins them with Christ. 2) As Adam embodied all the souls of his race and individual men formed limbs and parts of his body, so Paul describes the Body of Christ as corporal; individual Christians form the members of Christ (cf. I Cor. 12:12ff.). 3) The first man was androgynous, composed of varied colors of clay; the New Man incorporates Jew and Gentile, male and female, without distinction (Gal. 3:28). 4) As Christ and the Church are closely enough identified for Paul to refer to the "body" as "Christ" (I Cor. 12:12), so "Adam" in the Old Testament stands generically for mankind; in Judaism he is the typical representative of mankind.²

These parallels and others which might be adduced do not, however, of themselves justify any assumption that Paul simply adopted the Jewish Adam-speculation and with a new Christian aura presented it as his doctrine. There is no immediate assurance that such speculation is the original source (Ursprung) of the body-concept. One is certain to be given cause to reconsider any simple answer to the problem of the source of the concept when one is faced

¹Op. cit., pp. 53ff.

²Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., p. 57 n.4. On the whole of the subject of the Adam-speculation see chapter II, supra.

with the imposing list of defenders of theories which are greatly at variance.¹

Completely severed from his Jewish heritage, but lying right at hand was the Stoic doctrine of the organic nature of the universe. The proximity of this conception to the Body-concept will be readily apparent from S. Hanson's summary:

In the Stoa the interest in unity is central...Cosmos is conceived as ζῶον, a living being, an organic unity. The world is a σῶμα, a body where the individual parts have grown together and suffers with the other, so that they conjointly form an organic unity. The factor creating unity in this universal organism is the λόγος ὁρῶς of the universe, which constitutes its essence, its laws, and its bond, and conjoins the various parts of cosmos into a living unity.²

Even more striking parallels such as Seneca's eulogizing reference to Nero:

"You are the soul, (animus) of your community, which is your body," are to be found.³ In Plato's metaphor describing the state as a body, there are analogies drawn between functions of the members of a body and those of the arms of the body-politic.⁴ As T.W. Manson says, "The uniqueness of the phrase is not in the word σῶμα but in the qualifying genitive. The body is not τὸ σῶμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν but τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ."⁵ It is essential

¹W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, op. cit., pp. 160ff.; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 137; cf. 52f.; J.A.T. Robinson has provided a convenient list of the main views and their defenders, op. cit., p. 55.

²Op. cit., p. 52.

³See further J.B. Lightfoot, Philippians, op. cit., p. 286 and T. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 128f. as well as G.C. Richards, "Parallels to a New Testament Use of σῶμα," J.T.S., Vol. 38, 1937, p. 165.

⁴The Republic, bk. 5.462.d (see J. Moffatt, I Corinthians, op. cit., p. 187 for a translation). C. Chavasse thinks that this is the source of Paul's use of the term (cf. The Bride of Christ, op. cit., p. 17).

⁵"A Parallel to a New Testament Use of σῶμα," J.T.S., Vol. 37, 1936, p. 385. See J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 49f. Of I Cor. 6:15, Robinson says, "In this instance he is quite clearly referring not to a society but to a person, viz., Christ. To say that individuals are members of a

to note that Paul's use of the figure is violent and not merely a simile or metaphor¹ as J.A.T. Robinson has stressed:

But it is of great importance to see that when Paul took the term *σῶμα* and applied it to the Church, what it must have conveyed to him and his readers was (to employ a distinction which itself would have surprised him) something not corporate but corporal. It directed the mind to a person; it did not of itself suggest a social group.²

It is plainly evident that the problem of the realism of the conception of the Body of Christ must be solved in the light of the sources and background of Paul as indicated by the usage which he made of the figure. As long as the parallels in Hellenistic and Early Jewish sources appear to be equally suited to provide such a source³ we are forced to re-examine the development of the body-concept in the Epistles themselves.

2. The Development of the Body Concept in Paul's Thought. - In the impasse which we encounter in attempting to find the source of Paul's doctrine of the Body of Christ, we may do well to re-state a hypothesis suggested by Dillistone, namely, that the "Body" may well be the result of Paul's own creative

person is indeed a very violent use of language - and the context shows that Paul obviously meant it to be violent" (*ibid.*, p. 50). See F.A. Christie, *op. cit.*, p. 127; W.N. Pittenger, *op. cit.*, pp. 12f.; E. Percy, *op. cit.*, p. 5; C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, *op. cit.*, p. 138. For a more philosophic consideration of the idea of the Church as an organism, see L.S. Thornton, The Incarnate Lord, *op. cit.*, pp. 37ff.

¹Cf. the Midrash Eccles. R. 9.15. par. 8 which compares a little city to a body. The few men in it are the limbs.

²*Op. cit.*, p. 50; so A.E.J. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, p. 231. Cf. M. Goguel, "L'Idée d'Eglise dans le Nouveau Testament," Origine et Nature de l'Eglise, *op. cit.*, p. 64; J. Armitage Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

³Cf. F.W. Dillistone, The Structure of the Divine Society, London, 1951, p. 64. G.E. Wright denies the Hellenistic character of the figure (The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, *op. cit.*, p. 81). On the other hand, K.L. Schmidt alludes to H. Schlier's "Zum Begriff der Kirche im Eph." in *Theol. Blätt.* (1927), pp. 12ff. and Christus und die Kirche im Eph., "with favor. He feels that the doctrine of the Church as the Body and Christ

thinking.¹ In any case it is of more profit to our understanding of the character of the figure if we look for the authorization and purpose of using the body-concept instead of the origin only.² The development of Paul's teaching on the "Body" suggests that he found this authorization within the Old Testament just as he did for the figures which we have discussed so far.³

a) We may commence our study of the development of the conception with the assumption that I Corinthians is the earliest Epistle which refers to the idea of the "Body of Christ." The figure is mentioned incidentally in chapter 6:15-17. In this passage which has an ethical motivation,⁴ Paul refers to the bodies of Christians as the members ($\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta$) of Christ (vs. 15). It is important to note that the context involves the Old Testament marriage injunction which declares that husband and wife become one "flesh" (cf. Gen. 2:24). From this passage Paul concludes that the union between a believer and a harlot incorporates both in one body (vs. 16). Over-looking any distinction between the terms "flesh" and "body"⁵ he says, "he that is joined to a harlot is one body." It follows that the community of

as the Head is consistent with the Gnostic world of ideas (cf. "The Church," op. cit., pp. 16ff.; cf. F.C. Baur, Paul, op. cit., II, 12f.

¹The Structure of the Divine Society, op. cit., p. 63.

²J. Moffatt says on this point, "For Christians who had not been trained in Hebrew traditions, body was...a more vivid and appealing symbol of solidarity and cohesion than covenant (I Corinthians, op. cit., p. 189).

³Although the parallel description is not very close, Wm. Robinson suggests the possibility that Ezekiel's vision in the valley of dry bones lies behind the idea of the Body (op. cit., p. 70).

⁴Paul always uses the body-concept to argue for something else (see C. Chavasse, op. cit., p. 66).

⁵Distinctions which elsewhere have a great deal of importance (cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 31; this author gives numerous instances in which Paul did use the term interchangeably, however).

flesh produced in marriage is comparable to the union with Christ.

But the transition to the term "body" is important for the understanding of vs. 17, "But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." By the term "spirit" Paul actually means, "spiritual body,"¹ to correspond to the union between the harlot and the Christian. "For him 'body' and 'spirit' are not related to 'personality' as image to reality. The image and the reality are one."²

b) In the second mention of the idea of the Body, found in I Corinthians 10:16f., an allusion is made to the participation in the Body through the Eucharist. As the loaf is a unity, so also is the Body.³ Although the evidence is indirect, the conception of the union of the Body is based on the New Covenant commemorated in the Communion fellowship.

c) The third reference to the Body (I Cor. 11:29) declares that judgment is sustained by those who do not discern (*μὴ διακρίνων*) the Body.⁴ While the reference is debatable, C.A.A. Scott's interpretation of the term *ἐκκλησία* as a reference to the Church is acceptable.⁵ Since the Body is mentioned in

¹Cf. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, op. cit., p. 209. On this whole section see A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., pp. 127f. In this connection the sequence of vs. 15 is important. One is amputated (*ἀρᾶς*) to become a member of a harlot.

²F.A. Christie, op. cit., p. 122.

³Against the R.V., A.V., and many interpreters, vs. 17 does not intend to say that the Church is one bread or loaf (cf. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, op. cit., p. 335). J. Weiss has a commendable translation: "Because one bread (is present) we, the many are one body; for we all have part in the one bread" (op. cit., p. 640). So also C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, pp. 142f.; S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 89; C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op. cit., p. 195 (note the reference to the Didache (9:4) and Cyprian (Eph. 62 par. 4)).

⁴C. Chavasse thinks the word "discerning" has a nuptial connotation (op. cit., p. 64 n.1; cf. p. 72).

⁵Op. cit., pp. 189f. Cf. G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 90; F.C. Baur, Paul, op. cit., II, 170.

instructions regarding the Eucharist we may again relegate this occurrence of the term to the conception of the New Covenant.

d) The advance found in the fourth occurrence of the term (I Cor. 12:27) is the designation of the Body specifically as belonging to Christ ($\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$).¹

While the emphatic $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and the anarthrous $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ denote a specific reference to the Church of Corinth,² Paul's characteristic understanding of the local manifestation of the universal Church in no way denies the unity or uniqueness of the one Body. This passage is of particular interest because of its treatment of the conception of the unity of Body effected through the agency of the Holy Spirit. Every aspect of the organic life of the Church has an inter-relationship and inter-dependence with every other aspect.³

e) In the fifth passage to mention the Body (Rom. 12:3ff.) there is yet another distinction. Rather than the "Body of Christ," it is here, "one Body in Christ," that is, in whom the members are one body.⁴ The intention of this passage, as that of the preceding (see above), is to describe the unity of the Body despite the diversity of the gifts exercised by its members.⁵

f) The progression indicated by the use of the formula "in Christ" in Romans, is carried further in Ephesians and Colossians in the distinction between the

¹"Hier wird somit die Gemeinde als Leib Christi geradezu mit Christus selbst identifiziert" (E. Percy, op. cit., p. 5).

²Cf. F.J. Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, op. cit., pp. 145f.

³W.N. Pittenger, op. cit., p. 13. The emphasis on the Holy Spirit has its background in the prophetic utterances such as Ezek. 37:14, "And shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord." In the same general context, the re-uniting of Israel under one King (Messiah) and the institution of the New Covenant is Predicted (cf. vss. 20ff.).

⁴Cf. E. Percy, op. cit., p. 5.

⁵Cf. Ibid., pp. 5f.

Body and the Head.¹ While we cannot in this limited space treat the multiplicity of ideas which Paul relates to the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, the most extensive passage (Eph. 5:22ff.) contains a significant point. In this hortatory passage, Paul makes it abundantly clear that he is thinking of the relationship of the Head (Christ) to the Body (the Church) in terms of the relationship of Authority which the husband rightfully exercises over the wife.² With a specific application of Genesis 2:24 to the Church as the Bride of Christ, Paul affirms that the Unity of "flesh" effected through marriage is the answer to the riddle of the relationship between the Head and the Body (cf. vss. 28ff.). To be sure it is a great mystery (vs. 32), but the analogy comes as close as any can come to disclosing the nature of the solidarity between the Church and Christ. It is significant that Paul goes on to indicate that the bond of this union is love just as it is in marriage. "Nevertheless do ye also severally love each one his own wife even as himself; and let the wife see that she fear her husband" (vs. 33, R.V.)³

We have stressed certain points to make our conclusion self-evident. It appears that Paul draws on the Old Testament declaration that marriage creates a unity of flesh between two partners to authorize if not originate his doctrine that the Church as the Bride united to Christ through the New Covenant forms

¹There are other distinctions: 1) the articular use of *σῶμα*, 2) *σῶμα* refers directly to the Ecclesia, not "ye" or "we", indicating the universal Church; 3) there is no comparison drawn with the human body; 4) there is no appeal to the idea of unity in spite of diversity. Note the phrase, *ἑσμεν ἀλλήλων μέλη* (Eph. 4:25).

²Cf. C. Chavasse, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

³J.A.T. Robinson makes the same point in his interpretation of Rom. 7:4 where the metaphor describing the union with Christ is, *εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὡμᾶς ἑτέρῳ*, denoting sexual union (*op. cit.*, p. 52).

the "flesh" or the "body" of Christ¹ (terms which are rendered ambiguous if they reflect the Hebrew understanding of בשר).

While the opinion that Paul thought of the Church in terms of the Second Eve, which had been created for Christ, the Last Adam, is more difficult to establish, there are some indications that this is the case. In I Corinthians 11:2ff., Paul appeals to the creation account to establish his doctrine on a proper attire and decorum in public and private worship. The same passage refers to the headship of Christ over the man (vs. 3):

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.

Men, constituting the representative membership of the Church united in the New Covenant relationship to Christ, are subjected to Christ in the same manner as the wife is to her husband.

In I Timothy 2:12ff., Paul refers again to the First Parents and the implications which their roles have in the conducting of the affairs of the Church. The position of women is determined by the gullibility of Eve and the position of authority given to men in the Church follows upon Adam's choice of a self-determined course of action. This passage may have a further significance derived from an inference. If Adam sinned, although he knew of the consequences, he must have done so out of love for Eve. In the passage where Paul most explicitly refers to Christ as the fulfilment of the contrast with Adam (Phil. 2:6ff.) and elsewhere, there is a manifest corres-

¹These points clearly find their counterpart in the teaching of the Old Testament regarding Israel which was united in marriage with Yahweh through the covenant; but, this designation of Israel as the Bride could never have arrived at Paul's conclusion although the Scriptures made it possible. The gulf separating God and men made such a conclusion impossible. Dillistone does remark cogently however, regarding the metaphor of the Bride, "Nowhere is organic imagery so closely interwoven with covenantal" (Structure of the Divine Society, op. cit., p. 69).

pondence. Christ became a sin offering for His Bride; He was completely aware of the implications of His choice but willingly took upon Himself the penalty of the Church because of His love (Eph. 5:2).¹

In a more elaborate argument, C. Chavasse has isolated more technical evidence for this conclusion. He notes that the Hebrew text reads: "The rib which the Lord God had taken from the "man" builded ($\begin{smallmatrix} \text{בָּנָה} \\ \text{בָּנָה} \end{smallmatrix} \end{smallmatrix})$ he into a woman" (Gen. 2:22). It is possible that when Paul describes the "building up" of the Body through the ministry of the leaders of the Church (Eph. 4:12) he has this term in mind. This passage continues:

...But speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into him, who is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love (vss. 15f., R.V.).²

It might be suggested that around the Rib, that is, the flesh of the Last Adam crucified (Col. 1:22) was built up the new Bride, the Second Eve (cf. Col. 3:10, Eph. 4:24 with Rom. 7:4).³ By this analogy, the Body of Christ is the extension of the personality of Christ in the same way in which Eve was the projection of the body of Adam out of which she was formed.⁴ As Adam and

¹See A. Nygren, Agape and Eros, trans. P.S. Watson, London, 1953, p. 120. By fusing the figures of the Suffering Servant and the Last Adam, Christ does what the First Man could not do, namely, reverse the divine sentence against humanity by undeservingly exhausting the penalty in Himself (cf. A.G. Hebert, op. cit., p. 171).

²In the term "build" and its derivatives, there is an ideological tie made between the figures of the Boy¹ and Temple (which we shall discuss later). In a strange switch, Paul speaks of the Temple growing in the Lord (Eph. 2:21). Both growth and building occur in Eph. 4:16 (see S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 133).

³Cf. C. Chavasse, op. cit., p. 79.

⁴Ibid., p. 70. R.V.G. Tasker says, "She (the Church) is only the Body of Christ because she is primarily the mystical Bride of Christ" (The Old Testament in the New Testament, 2nd ed., London, 1954, p. 98).

Eve were "one flesh" in a unique sense, so Christ and the Church in an equally unique sense (i.e. spiritual¹) form the Body of Christ.

Finally, there is a strong inference that the Church described as the "chaste virgin espoused to one husband (Christ)," is the Second Eve, for Paul in this same context warns that the Church may be corrupted just as Eve was seduced through the craftiness of the Serpent (II Cor. 11:2f.).²

In summary, it appears that Paul's doctrine of the Church as the Bride of Christ is prior to His postulation that it is the Body of Christ. The idea of the Bride came directly from the Old Testament where Israel is designated as the "wife of Yahweh."³ This marriage was consummated through the old covenant and finds its counterpart in Paul's reference to Israel married to the law.⁴ When Christ died, the old covenant was dissolved and the marriage bond broken, making Israel again free to marry (Rom. 7:1ff.).⁵ Through the New Covenant, a new betrothal vow has been contracted with Christ and the New Israel its partners. The union has made of both one spiritual basar,

¹Cf. L. Newbigin, op. cit., p. 71.

²If it were possible to find a nuptial relationship in Eph. 1:4, "chosen in him before the foundation of the world," there might be a suggestion of the oriental betrothal custom in which marriage contracts were made by parents. In that case, "in Him" would be a reference to Eve's existence in the Last Adam before her separation and creation.

³G.E. Wright suggests that the origin of the "Bride of Christ" is to be found in an allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs (applied realistically to Israel by Jewish commentators) or in Hosea (Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, op. cit., p. 82; cf. A. Lods, "Les Antécédents de la Notion d'Eglise en Israel," op. cit., p. 50).

⁴This may be a polemical allusion to the Rabbinic eulogizing of the marriage between the Lord and Israel through the covenant at Sinai. The Torah is the marriage contract; Moses leads the Bride to the meeting with Jehovah.

⁵C. Chavasse, op. cit., p. 79.

that is, one Body. This is again another example of the mystery of the New Israel. No longer can racial and religious ties form a barrier for the Gentiles. Adam and Eve were created and united before there were any such distinctions. The New Age reverses the subsequent characteristics of the Old Aeon in the dissolution of all distinctions in Christ, in (or out of) whom the new man is created (Eph. 2:15; cf. 4:24).

It is more than likely that Paul may have resorted to either Rabbinic or Hellenistic "body-concepts" to embellish his doctrine of the Body of Christ.¹ On the other hand, we cannot subscribe to the opinion that Paul found his authorization in either of these general sources, where in most cases the body is used either as a symbol² or simile and rarely is more than purely metaphorical. Paul uses the figure of the Body to designate a reality which goes beyond figurative speech. It involves the Hebrew conception of the Word of God, calling into existence that which is not actual.³ Thus the election of Israel and the Church are realities apart from visible evidence. In the historical Genesis account of the creation of Eve, the realism of the conception of the sharing of a common flesh and life was evidently appropriated by Paul to describe the realism of Christ living in His Body. Christ, as Adam

¹Cf. e.g. I Cor. 12 with Aristotle, Politics, Bk. 2 par. 2.2f. (Loeb Cl. Lib. ed., trans. H. Rackham, London, 1932, pp. 84ff.). The Rabbinic doctrine of the creation of Adam has already been mentioned. They also used the simile of the body to describe the principle of corporate suffering.

²Cf. R.M. MacIver, op. cit., pp. 68ff., especially 81.

³Note that in the Old Testament's closest counterpart to the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ in Ezek. 37.1-10, the bones are "very dry" so that there is no possible sign of life among them, but the Word of God instills breath in them with the result that the bones become an army of living men clothed in flesh and skin. The breath is the Spirit of God which creates life from the dead (vs. 14).

did, exists in His Bride, yet apart from her.¹ The Church exists literally only through the life which it derives from Christ; it is therefore identifiable with the Source of that life (I Cor. 1:13) but distinct from it. The personality of Christ receives, so to speak, an extension in the life of the Body on earth.²

3. Christ, the Last Adam, as the Head of the New Aeon. - Although we have already covered some of the subject at hand, we must now direct our attention to the cosmic implications of Paul's Adam-typology. In this section we must be reminded again that Paul, in direct continuity with his Jewish heritage, did not think of mankind as isolated within the broad confines of the universe. Beyond the solidarity of individuals within the race, we learned through our examination of the doctrine of the Fall that there is a further principle of solidarity which united the whole animate and inanimate world. Paul's doctrine of Christ as the Last Adam fits into the converse side of the picture of Adam as the head of the Old Aeon and the cosmic implications are correspondingly greater because of the nature of His person.

a. The Identification of Christ with the Cosmos. - The identification of Christ with the Old Aeon begins with His pre-existence and subsequent

¹Cf. J.-L. Leuba, op. cit., p. 136. This is the direction in which we must look for the solution of the problems raised by G. Johnston, op. cit., pp. 88f., 93f. The "I and thou" relationship continues to hold true within the Body. Cf. J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, op. cit., p. 167; D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 128.

²Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development, London, 1936, pp. 147f. It is interesting that the Hebrew conception of the human body (cf. Appendix A) lent itself to Paul's teaching on the Body of Christ in that the soul and the flesh were coterminus in extent, the latter being the manifestation of the former. In so far as there was any idea of a diffusion of consciousness, that too would fit the independence of the members within the unity of the whole. In any case, the solidarity of the body was the closest Hebraic figure that Paul could have used and still maintain the "I and thou" relationship within it.

incarnation. He was the Son of God (Gal. 4:4) existing in the form of God (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων), who emptied Himself of the divine likeness to become as a man (ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, Phil. 2:6f.; cf. Gal. 4:4). Christ's incarnation through the medium of human birth (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός) realistically identified Him with the totality of mankind. This identification could not have been posited without Christ becoming a member of the group which He represents. He who was formerly outside the community of men, became through the process of birth, a part of the human family.¹

It is essential to understand Paul's view of the "flesh" at this juncture. When he speaks of Christ coming in the "likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3) he is implying a great deal more than human appearance. One might say that Paul considered the flesh to be a sort of metaphysical substance in which all men share. "Thus, a blow struck at Sin by any human being who partakes of the 'flesh' is struck on behalf of all."² It is the same totality which allowed Sin to gain mastery of the whole of the race through Adam's sinning. It is true that Christ is different from the rest of the race of men, in that He committed no sin (Rom. 8:3, II Cor. 5:21); but, that does not mean that He did not live a truly human life, indeed, the only truly human life.³ Thus He fulfilled the original intention of God in the creation of Adam and merits the designation of the complete "image

¹Cf. W. Koester, op. cit., p. 31; E.L. Mascall, Christ, the Christian and the Church, op. cit., p. 75.

²C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 95. Cf. H. Lietzmann, an die Römer, op. cit., p. 79; J. Denney, Studies in Theology, 3rd ed., London, 1895, pp. 79, 99.

³C.H. Dodd, Romans, op. cit., p. 120; cf. The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., pp. 95f.; D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 53.

of God" (I Cor. 15:49, Phil., 2:6). Yet with all this, Christ is not a new creation but completely identified with human existence in its distance from God, in the totality of the "flesh."¹

Now, this corporate totality which mankind constitutes,² had become a part of the Old Aeon and its consequent subjection to the nefarious forces at work therein. The original creation of God, although marred by the incursion of Sin, was not destroyed. In that stead, a plan of redemption was imposed upon it which corresponded to the manner in which it was brought into thralldom. Therefore, human nature which was no longer a neutral element in its corporate identification with the powers of the Old Aeon had to be redeemed through Christ's defeating of each of these hostile forces in Himself. According to Paul's doctrine, Christ had to become identified with Sin, "Flesh," Death, Law, and rebellious spiritual forces.³ The redemption of the race is effected through overcoming these forces within the totality of the race and thus completely counteracting the results of the transgression of Adam.⁴ These ideas find more or less explicit mention in the Epistles.

¹Cf. further J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 38; David Somerville, op. cit., pp. 37ff.; M.J. Sheehan, op. cit., p. 438. See C.A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 186ff. for a discussion of Rom. 8:3 and very acceptable conclusions.

²A. Nygren, Romans, op. cit., p. 232; cf. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life..., op. cit., p. 15. Says E.L. Mascall on this subject: "We can hardly deny that manhood is a common generic essence in which all men share - the fact that humans procreate humans is enough to indicate this - and this generic essence is far more significant, it is far more the manifestation of an indivisible principle, than is waxhood or even doghood...In the sense just described the universal has in man a primacy over the particular that is found in none of the sub-human creation..." (op. cit., p. 73; cf. further p. 74).

³On this subject see J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 34ff. G.H.C. Macgregor, "Principalities and Powers," op. cit., p. 23 and C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., pp. 89f.

⁴O. Moe, The Apostle Paul, His Life and His Work, trans. L.A. Vigness, Minneapolis, 1950, p. 393.

a. Sin. - In II Corinthians 5:21, "...he made to be sin on our behalf," definitely teaches that Christ was identified with sin.¹ Although Christ was one with humanity in every other relationship to Sin, He nevertheless did not consent to its dominion.² Sin which had heretofore reigned unchallenged was defeated in the sinless life of our Lord. This passage further implies the death of Christ. As death cannot reign over a dead subject, those who are united in Him (through death) are thereby also made free from Sin's reign (Rom. 6:2, 10).

b. Flesh. - The Incarnation unavoidably meant that Christ participated in the "flesh" (I Tim. 3:16, "who (Christ) appeared in flesh" implies humanity apart from God for the next phrase refers to His "justification (vindication) in the Spirit."). "God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3), means that "He was so truly man that the flesh He bore was human flesh as it had come to be, an appanage of sin, the open field of sin's activity."³ Not only did Christ successfully repel the attack of Sin in His flesh, but through His death He deprived the hostile forces which held human "flesh" in thralldom of their point of attack.⁴ The integral relationship of the "flesh" to the Old Age and its control, was wrested by Christ through His realistic

¹L.S. Thornton, The Common Life, op. cit., p. 45.

²C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op. cit., p. 249; cf. C.A. Wood, pp. 169ff.

³C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op. cit., p. 248.

⁴J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 45.

representation of those who are identified with Him.¹

c. Death. - On the Cross, Christ completely and voluntarily identified Himself with the plight of the Aeon under the dominion of Death. The victory of this "last enemy" over Him was only apparent, however.² In the resurrection, lay the seeds of the complete overthrow of Death's dominion in the Aeon (cf. Rom. 6:9). In the New Age inaugurated through the resurrection of Christ, it is Life that reigns (Rom. 5:17). The grave is no longer the dismal goal of human existence (I Cor. 15:50ff.). To those who are given to participate in the resurrection life of Christ through the Holy Spirit, in

¹Cf. F. Prat, op. cit., II, 208; E. Loymeyer, Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie, op. cit., pp. 137ff., 168.

²Cf. C.A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 202ff.

At this point the vexed question of the Jewish New Year Festival which later became the Feast of Tabernacles (A.R. Johnson, "The Role of the King," op. cit., p. 85) becomes important. In a ritual which takes for its background the creative work of God, the drama re-enacts the combat between the forces of Life and Death. The king, playing the leading role, symbolically is killed and restored through the re-creative power of God. This means the concomitant revival of the social unit for another year (A.R. Johnson, ibid., p. 97). In line with these features, Johnson interprets Psalm 89 thus: "The Davidic king is the Servant of Jahweh; but, as we see from the above lines, at the New Year Festival he is the suffering Servant. He is the Messiah of Jahweh; but on this occasion he is the humiliated Messiah...The ritual combat, which we have discussed above, is one between the Davidic king, as the Messiah of Jahweh, and the opposing kings of Earth; and it is only when the outlook is blackest that the God of Hosts intervenes on behalf of the former, and delivers him (and ipso facto his people) from 'Death'" (ibid., p. 100). E.O. James sees the significance of the foregoing in the New Testament: "All this finds its counterpart on a spiritual plane in the Messiahship of Christ and the doctrine of the 'Second Adam'. In its pagan form the death and resurrection drama was a mystery play on the theme, 'Out with famine, in with health and wealth,' in which the king was the principal actor, and the story of Creation was re-enacted as part of the ritual struggle" ("The Sources of Christian Ritual," The Labyrinth, op. cit., p. 238). James continues: "It was not difficult to spiritualize the ancient symbolism in terms of the universal King and Saviour of mankind laying down His life in voluntary self-obligation, and henceforth communicating Himself sacramentally to His people in the outward and visible signs of initiation sacrifice and communion" (ibid., p. 256). The question remains after all is said and done, whether Paul and his audience would be aware of these ideas in so conscious a manner that they might have influenced his doctrine of Christ.

the place of slavery to death and its fears (as well as its co-partner, Sin), a glorious emancipation has been proclaimed. Its guarantee of fulfilment is placarded in the resurrection of Christ, the Firstfruits (I Cor. 15:20ff.).¹

d. The Law. - Paul explicitly affirms that Christ was born under the law that He might redeem those who are under the Law (Gal. 4:4f.).² As the Law had become implicated in the Old Age, (Gal. 4:3; cf. supra pp. 223ff.) it was essential that Christ should become identified with it that He might successfully fulfil its claims upon mankind as well as throw off its shackles.³ In life, Christ perfectly fulfilled the Law; in death came the end of the demands of the Law for both Christ and those identified with Him (Rom. 7:4). Legal injunctions have no binding force after one's death (Rom. 7:1ff.; Col. 2:20ff.);⁴ therefore, dying to the Law makes possible "life unto God" (Gal. 2:19).

e. Hostile Spirit-forces. - Finally and climactically Paul declares of

¹Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., pp. 104ff. For this reason, death is not significant as entrance into the New Aeon, but the dissolution of the Old (ibid., p. 79).

²Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 72; C.A. Wood, pp. 179ff.

³Cf. F. Prat, op. cit., II, 208.

⁴There is an interesting argument in Galatians 3 which produces the same conclusion. Because of Jewish ancestry, Jesus fulfilled the requirements of the Law. Because He never failed to keep all of the injunctions of the Law, He escaped the just condemnation of all men under the Law (vss. 10-12). He was nevertheless pronounced accursed by the Law in lieu of the manner of His death (cf. Gal. 3:13 with Deut. 21:23). It is obvious that this curse was unmerited, meaning that it had no just force over Christ (cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 39f.). Paul concludes that the death of Christ exhausts the dominion of the Law over Jews (cf. Col. 2:13ff., Eph. 2:15; Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 101; F. Prat, op. cit., II, 205f.). This is the recurrence of the theme of the New Israel in that the penalty incurred through Gentile sin and the curse fallen on Jews who failed to keep the Law (both ideas are inter-related as we have seen) are both absolved in the one self-sacrifice of Christ. Thus in Christ the New Israel has fulfilled the Law (Rom. 3:3) even as it is dead to the Law through the body of Christ (Rom. 7:4).

Christ: ...of Christ and His victory. The very character of the

...Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and he has seized it from the midst (i.e. removed it), nailing it to the cross, having disrobed himself of the principalities and authorities,¹ he made an open show of them, triumphing over them in himself (Col. 2:14f.).

The stage is the Aeon. Its spirit-rulers had drawn up a list of charges against man who was guilty, particularly of the transgression of the Law. On the Cross, the claims of the accusers (i.e. the principalities of the Aeon) were satisfied. At the same time as Christ divested them of any rights over Himself (involved in the word ἀπεκδυάμενος) He earned the reprieve of the New Race incorporated in Him.² Through Christ's identification with humanity enslaved in the Aeon He was obliged to meet the specific forces which held man in their sway with the result that Paul says, "...Jesus Christ, giving himself for (ὑπὲρ) our sins, so that he might extract (ἐξέληται) us out of this present evil age" (τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος Gal. 1:4).

The whole of this discussion throws into striking relief Paul's own conception of the solidarity of the race. For the actuality of the redemption depended entirely on the realistic identification of Christ with human existence that He might reverse the archetypal role of Adam in the Old Aeon. But the question of the extent of this reversal quite naturally arises. The extent of the New Aeon must be approached from two sides: 1) the cosmic significance of man in the universe, and 2) Paul's conception of the cosmic

¹Following Ellicott, Lightfoot and contrary to Abbott, Ephesians and Colossians, op. cit., pp. 258f. See further C.A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 173ff.

²It is difficult if not impossible to know in what sense Paul thought of Christ's identification with the ἐξουσία of the Old Age (cf. Col. 1:16). He makes no allusion to the temptations of Satan or Sin as to the Synoptics and Hebrews. It may be most correct to understand Paul's view as a mediated identification (i.e. through his humanity) rather than in a more or less immediate sense.

significance of Christ and His victory. The very character of the Apostle's doctrine forced him to conclude that in the New Age the restoration of the Creation to a proper relationship to God would be as complete as was the corruption of the original intention of creation in the Old Age. This restoration was not a cataclysmic complete event effected in the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, yet this Event was the guarantee of the future consummation of the reconciliation. In the words of C.H. Dodd: "What He wrought on our behalf is also wrought into the very fabric of the universe in which we live."¹

The skeleton of Paul's conception of the restoration is the principle of selective representation.² From the selection of the Apostles by Christ as His shaliachim,³ and the nucleus of the original Church baptized with the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the process moves from the One (Christ)

¹The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 105.

²Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 61. This is the reversal of the principle of selective representation found in the Old Testament. In brief, it is: 1) mankind for Creation; 2) one people chosen to be determinative for the salvation of all men; 3) failing in its mission necessitated the representation of the Remnant; 4) finally the Remnant is reduced to the Servant of the Lord or the Son of Man, pointing to a fixed point in history (cf. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 116; H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of the Apocalyptic, op. cit., p. 31; C.H. Dodd, Romans, op. cit., p. 186). We noted in chapter I, that the idea of selective representation was carried out in Israel itself. Thus, out of the nation, the firstborn belonged to the Lord. For these were substituted the Levites, the tribe chosen to represent Israel before the Lord. Out of the tribe of Levi, was chosen the line of the priests; from this line comes the High Priest, who represents the whole of the nation before God. Thus Philo (De Som. II, 187f. Loeb Cl. Lib. ed., trans. and ed. F.H. Coulson and G.H. Whitaker, Vol. V, London, 1934, pp. 527ff.) refers to the High Priest as the one standing alone, being a whole people, the human race, midway between God and man (cf. C.H. Dodd, Romans, op. cit., pp. 186ff.; G. Johnston, op. cit., p. 78 n.6).

³That is envoys, authorized agents who go in the name of Him who sends them; in this case the risen Christ (cf. K.H. Rengstorff, "Apostleship" Bible Key Words, (T.W.N.T.), London, 1952, p. 29). While the grounds of apostleship were limited by an encounter with the risen Lord and a personal commission (ibid., p. 43), and could not be passed on, it was the Apostles who

to the Many (the Church). This constitutes the present spacial center of the Lordship of Christ in the universe.¹ From the constitution of the New People of God, the process of reconciliation increases to involve the whole creation in a final restoration² (Rom. 8:19ff.) until Christ is all in all (Col. 3:11) because all things are subjected under Him (I Cor. 15:28).

Paul saw the New Aeon in the process of replacing the Old. The acceptance of the gospel is the temporary means of the advancement of the New Age because of its identification with the New Humanity (the present manifestation of the restoration of the creation; cf. Col. 1:23 with II Cor. 5:17, Col. 3:11).³ Increasing significance of the New Aeon lay in the future.

were the missionary representatives of the Church. Thus it was through them that the larger group of the Church are called. See also C.T. Craig, The One Church, London, 1952, pp. 57ff.

¹O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 151.

²Cullmann adds a fourth category between the Church and the whole Creation, seeing a redemption of all of humanity in the Kingdom of God (ibid., p. 117). C.H. Dodd after rendering Rom. 11:32 as, "God has consigned all men to disobedience, that he may have mercy on all," concludes that Paul considered it to be the will of God that all men should ultimately be saved (Romans, op. cit., p. 183; note the chart on p. 187). But this universalism has difficulties. The πάντας may be relative or as Sanday and Headlam suggest, collective (so also W. Morgan, op. cit., p. 249). Paul does not mention any implications which the resurrection will have for the wicked dead or of their inclusion in the eschatological kingdom (cf. I Cor. 6:9, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" He continues by giving a list of those which are to be excluded.). Paul's reference to the πληρωμα των εθνων (Rom. 11:25) cannot well mean all Gentiles any more than πας ἰσραηλ (11:26) refers to every individual in the historical existence of Israel. As the latter refers to Israel at a point in history in which the nation will be reconciled to God, the "fulness of the Gentiles" refers to the complement of the gracious election of God who are predestined to be saved (cf. Rom. 11:20f.). The lack of clarity arises out of the imminence of the Parousia, so that Paul apparently refers to his own generation as all that will exist. In this passage Paul does not consider the fate of the wicked and unbelieving, nor does he elsewhere. They are like the Old Testament Israelite, "cut off" from life and from the Community.

³W. Morgan insists that, "pressed to its logical conclusion, Paul's doctrine of an objective redemption would seem to involve the immediate and unconditional salvation of the whole human race (op. cit., p. 113). Ideally

Therefore, Paul looks to the return of Christ or immediately preceding it for the salvation of all Israel (cf. Rom. 11:26)¹ and the inclusion of the "fulness" of the Gentiles. Apparently he expected a great surge of converts from among the Gentiles at the time of the turning of the Jews (Rom. 11:15).² The salvation of Israel would be the signal of the resurrection (ζωή ἐκ νεκρῶν Rom. 11:15); that in turn would bring the work of the reconciliation of the New Israel to its completion (Phil. 1:6, 3:12ff., Col. 1:22; cf. Rom. 8:23).

Passages in Ephesians and Colossians refer to the cosmic significance of Christ's death and resurrection in His consequent exaltation. In the "fulness of times" all things will be "summed up" or "comprised" (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) in Him (Eph. 1:10).³ Through the atoning work of Christ the unity of creation destroyed by sin is restored culminating in the kingdom of the Son of His love which is brought into actual existence

the Church was co-extensive with humanity: "all who shared the manhood which Christ had taken were potentially members of the Ecclesia: its ideals were identical with the ideals of a cleansed and perfected humanity" (F.J. Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, op. cit., p. 142). To have made this ideal the actual reality would have under-cut Paul's whole doctrine of justification by faith.

¹Note the quotation of Is. 59:20f. referring to the coming Deliverer. Evidently Paul is thinking of the Parousia.

²The phrase "reconciliation of the world" is perforce to be understood by the principle of representative universalism. Thus, Paul can state that a large part of his task is completed and that there is no longer any place for him in the East — the West alone remains an open field for his activity (Rom. 15:18ff. especially vs. 23; cf. Col. 1:23). But there are few Christians and few churches even in the East. The acceptance of the Gospel has been representative meaning that the rest is sure to follow. (cf. J. Munch, "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament," J.T.S., New Series, Vol. 2, 1951, p. 8).

³Cf. D. Somerville, op. cit., pp. 176f. S. Hanson suggests that this passage presents Christ as the kephalaion of the universe in a representative role. "As its representative He is at the same time the totality of all things...In the atonement He represented the world, and restored the original unity of the cosmos" (op. cit., pp. 125f.).

achievement in the eschatological goal. As Lightfoot says, "It must end in unity, as it proceeded from unity: and the center of this unity is Christ."¹

It is difficult to ascertain to what extent Paul thinks of the terms "reconciliation" (ἀποκαταλλάξαι, Col. 1:19) and "subjection" (ὑποτέτακται I Cor. 15:27, Eph. 1:22) as synonymous. In I Corinthians 15:24ff., the latter emphasis is clarified by the "abolishing" (καταργήσῃ) of every (opposing) ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν (meaning powers of the category of Death and Sin, but not necessarily Discarnate intelligencies) which are the enemies brought under His feet in the eschatological Kingdom (vvs. 24f.). If the powers mentioned here are inclusive of the spiritual powers referred to in Ephesians and Colossians (i.e. the principalities and powers), the question revolves on the meaning which Paul intends in using the word "abolish." By comparing Philippians 2:10f. with II Thessalonians 2:8ff. (referring to the destruction of the Lawless One by the breath of His mouth (cf. Is. 11:4) two acceptable alternatives emerge. 1) The acknowledgment of Christ to be Lord is forced upon all beings ("every tongue") after which the wicked intelligences are destroyed (II Thess. 2:8ff.). 2) All mankind along with the Discarnate Intelligences will be given opportunity to share the benefits of the atonement and receive the reconciliation of Christ (Eph. 1:10; Col. 1:20). If they fail to appropriate these gifts of mercy, they are thoroughly discounted or destroyed so that universal unity is realized in the Kingdom delivered up to God (I Cor. 15:24).

Paul's view of the restoration of the material creation is somewhat clearer. Possibly under the influence of a passage such as Isaiah 11 and its prophetic

¹Colossians and Philemon, op. cit., p. 153.

out of the realm of darkness (Col. 1:13). The unity is eschatological; as yet not every knee has bowed in acknowledgment of the Lordship of Christ (Phil. 2:10), nor has every enemy been brought into complete subjection under Him (I Cor. 15:25ff.). Nevertheless, every intelligence shall confess that Christ is Lord, whether it be of the earthly, heavenly, or sub-terrestrial sphere (Phil. 2:10f.).

Paul's most extensive treatment of the conception of the cosmic restoration in Christ is found in Colossians 1:14ff.:

In whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of sins: ~~who~~ is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things and in him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: ~~who~~ is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens (R.V.).

Even as Christ has been given the Headship of the New Humanity in His Body, so does He include representatively all that has been created because He is the "Firstborn of all creation."¹ As He is the Source of all existence as the Creator, it is by Him that all things consist² and continue to exist. But the Fall brought opposition and rebellion into the very fibre of the universe which must be removed through a reconciliation effected through the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ of the Cross³ which will find its complete

¹Cf. W. Wrede, op. cit., pp. 102f.; D. Somerville, op. cit., p. 67.

²J.S. Stewart correctly points to this conception as reminiscent of the Stoic doctrine of the universe bound together by the world-soul, although of course, there are differences. A Man in Christ, op. cit., p. 59. Cf. W. Koester, op. cit., p. 51.

³Unity through the atonement is the theme of Colossians (S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 107). See further D. Somerville, op. cit., pp. 163ff.

creation. Like Old Testament and post-Biblical Messianism the Apostle proposes an eschatological significance in his doctrine of Christ. Jesus Christ as the Son of God (cf. Ps. 2:7ff.) and as the Son of Man is the Second Adam (I Cor. 15:45) or, "as we might say in current language, the eschatological Adam. He bears the image of God (II Cor. 4:5), and he is the New Man (Col. 3:9ff.). He is *monogenēs*, *prōtotōcos*, *archē*. In Christ there is a new creation (II Cor. 5:17)."¹

The universalism of the New Covenant predicted by Isaiah (42:6ff.) has been fulfilled in the Servant and in His constitution of the New Community of the Elect from among all nations of the earth (Eph. 2:11ff., Col. 3:11f., Gal. 3:28). The fountain "for sin and separation for uncleanness" of which Zechariah spoke (13:1), has been provided in the shed blood of the unique and actual sacrifice of the True Isaac (Rom. 3:25; Eph. 1:7, 5:2; cf. Titus 2:14, 3:5). The out-pouring of the Holy Spirit foretold by Ezekiel (36:24-27) and Joel (2:28-32) has been experienced by the New Israel in the New Age.² The prophecy of the nations coming to worship the Lord in the "house of the God of Jacob," seen by Micah (4:1ff.) and Isaiah (2:2ff.) is in the process of fulfilment in the increasing acceptance of the gospel by the Gentiles (Rom. 9:24ff., 10:12ff., 15:8ff.), and in the creation of the corporate Temple (Eph. 2:20ff.). As Micah predicted that the judgment of the Lord from Zion would bring peace to the world (Micah 4:3ff.), Paul sees the Headship of Christ uniting the communities of Jews and Gentiles together in peace (Eph. 2:13ff.; cf. 5:23).

¹A. Fridrichsen, "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," The Root of the Vine, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

²Cf. Wm. Manson, "Mission and Eschatology," *op. cit.*, p. 390.

picture of the implications of the coming Messianic Kingdom in the animal-world and its return to an Eden-like peace, Paul saw the future release of the Creation from the "bondage of corruption" (Rom. 8:21).¹ In the New Aeon, the vanity (ματαιότης) to which the creation has become subjected through its control by subordinate and partly hostile powers awaits the revelation of the "sons of God," which is the Second Advent of the Son of Man in the company of the saints. This points to the Parousia as the decisive event in the consummation of the restoration of the whole Creation. The dissident elements, rebellious spirit-forces and wicked men, are either destroyed or put out of the way. The solidarity of the Creation including men and everything outside of humanity is thus influential in the final actualization of the original intention of God in creating the universe. The old solidarity of the body of sin has its counterpart in the creation of the Body of Christ.² The New Age is superseding the Old, only in the end to displace it entirely. In brief, the reconciliation of the world through Christ (II Cor. 5:19) "has reference beyond the limits of the human race, and the vague phrase of I Corinthians 15:28 'that God may be all in all' receives a more precise and fuller meaning."³

4. Conclusion. - We must point out in summary that the Christology and Soteriology which Paul expresses in the Epistles is not one of his own

¹We follow the opinions of Cullmann (Christ and Time, op. cit., p. 103) and Bultmann (New Testament Theology, op. cit., pp. 251f.) in opposition to various interpreters, that the "creation" in this passage does not refer to man in unbelief but to the universe (cf. E.C. Rust, op. cit., pp. 235f.).

²J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 79.

³C.H. Dodd, The Mind of Paul: Change and Development, Reprint from the B.J.R.L., Vol. 18, #1, 1934, pp. 41f.

This revolution is going on apace. The resurrection foretold by Isaiah (26:19) and Daniel (12:3) has already had "firstfruits" fulfilment in the risen Christ (I Cor. 15:20, 23). The completion of its fulfilment awaits His return in the company of the saints (I Thess. 4:14). The subjection of the forces of evil is effectively being realized (Col. 2:15, I Cor. 15:25f., 28). Even now they are unable to "separate us from the love of God" (Rom. 8:38f.). As Wm. Manson says, this incompleteness "gives rise in Christianity to a new eschatology of the things-which-are-not-yet-seen, an eschatology of glory which looks to the final victory, or Parousia, of Christ. While the new Christian age represents the fulfilment of the old prophetic eschatology, nevertheless Christianity by the very nature of its experience is impelled to a further end."¹ Still lying in the future is the redemption of the cosmos from the bondage of corruption incurred through the lust of Adam and his race. Isaiah's new world (chap. 11) will be seen in the reconciliation of all things under the reign of Christ (I Cor. 15:28) who in turn asserts His subjection to the Father, that God may be all in all (I Cor. 15:28). The original unity of all is thereby restored and the universal reign of God will continue without any challenge.

Metaphorical Figures Denoting the Solidarity of the New Humanity

We must turn back to pick up some of the loose strands in Paul's conception of the solidarity of the Church. Pfleiderer has noted that the nature of the Christian Community is only indicated by figurative comparisons,² a conclusion which is strikingly borne out in Paul's teaching on the mysterious

¹Ibid., p. 391.

²Paulinism, op. cit., pp. 229f.

unity of the Church.

1. The Corporate Temple. - Among the figures which Paul adopts to indicate the nature of the Church, that of the "Temple" and the equivalent "Building of God,"¹ are especially significant. The first reference to the Community as constituting a corporate temple occurs in I Corinthians 3:16f.:

Know ye not that ye are God's temple and the Spirit of God dwells in you? If any man destroy the temple of God, this one God will destroy, for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.

Paul's interest in reminding the Corinthians Christians that they are the House of God, is purely to promote unity in the Community. The schism which has split the Church into numerous cliques is not consonant with the unity of the one Temple in which God has chosen to dwell through the one Spirit. If any man destroys this unity through his divisive influence, he will be removed from the picture.² The holiness of the corporate Temple is destroyed by division

¹It is not altogether certain that Paul's reference to the "building of God" (I Cor. 3:9) is an allusion to the Old Testament or Jewish temple. The phrase is couched among other metaphors which do not suggest a relationship to the temple-typology. On the other hand, the succeeding verses (although transferring the figure from a building as incorporating the Church, to a structure composed of the actions of the members of the Church) suggest the imagery relating to the building of the Tabernacle or Temple and all of the required precious elements (cf. vvs. 10ff.) (cf. A. Deissmann, Paul, op. cit., pp. 212f. A similar transference of imagery occurs in II Tim. 2:20ff. The "great house" may be the Temple. The Christians are vessels of two types. The ones purged from iniquity (vs. 19) are gold and silver, i.e. holy (vs. 21) but the unclean are dishonorable vessels of wood or crockery.). Equally difficult is the passage in I Tim. 3:15, "...that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (R.V. E.F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, London, N.D., p. 38, rules out the problem with the translation of οἶκος as "household." In that case the term relates to the figure of a family (see below) and not to the Temple.) The previous discussion argues against this being the Christian place of assembly for Paul's instructions refer to the government of the affairs of the Church not merely to matters of worship.

²"The repeated φερίπειν expresses the spontaneous reaction from God's side, a reaction which corresponds to the kind of offense" (R. Asting, op. cit., p. 207; holy, then is inviolable, ibid., pp. 209ff.).

even as the Jewish Sanctuary would have been if it had been neglected for local sanctuaries (note Deut. 12:13f. and Josh. 22:10ff.).

In the second reference to the temple-typology, the Apostle says, "Or know ye not that your (ὁμῶν) body (τὸ σῶμα)¹ is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God?" (I Cor. 6:19). It is difficult to know whether Paul intends that we should understand τὸ σῶμα to indicate the corporate Body (i.e. of Christ) or the individual bodies of believers. In any case the second Epistle to Corinth clears up the difficulty: "We are a temple of the living God;² even as God said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people (6:16; cf. Lev. 26:11, and Ezek. 37:27f. where the prophet relates the idea to the Messianic age). Following out a thought mentioned in the address on Mars Hill, namely, the denial that God dwells in temples of human construction (Acts 17:24), Paul concludes that the true Temple is composed of what Peter calls "living stones" (I Pet. 2:5).

The climax of the doctrine of the corporate Temple is found in Ephesians 2. In vs. 14, the distinctive feature of the old Jewish Temple is removed through the abolition of the middle wall separating the areas accessible to the outside world. Verses 19ff. describe the New Temple, composed of the united "household of God" founded on the Apostles and prophets, fitted together in agreement, and growing into a holy temple in the Lord. Jesus Christ is the chief corner or key stone (a shift from I Cor. 3:11 where Jesus Christ is the

¹ That is, in the singular, the difficulty of which may have prompted the correction in mss. L33, 69pm. If this passage refers to the individual body it is equivalent to the οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχουμεν (II Cor. 5:1) which is probably also individual in reference.

² Without apparent reason, Calvin takes this reference to apply to the bodies of individuals (The Epistle to the Ephesians, trans. Wm. Pringle, Grand Rapids, 1948, p. 245).

foundation rock¹). The whole Temple provides a dwelling place for God in the Spirit (vs. 22) who actualizes the presence of God in the corporate Temple.²

In Paul's Bible, יְהוָה and יְהוֹשֻׁעַ are used in reference to Israel (cf. Ruth 4:11, Jer. 24:6, 31:4, 42:10).³ There too, he found the conception of the Tabernacle and Temple as the locus of the presence of God. For Judaism of Paul's own day, there was only one Temple, occupying Mt Zion in Jerusalem. There the Shekinah rested in undiminished reality. The Temple area was the epitomization of the Land of Israel, the place from which Israel derived its characteristic of holiness. To the Temple was ascribed a cosmic significance (supra p. 98) which would be realized particularly in the Age to Come. Since Paul thought of the Church as the New Israel constituted through the advent and sacrifice of Jesus, the Messiah, and endowed with the Holy Spirit effecting the indwelling of the presence of God in the Church,⁴ this figure of the Temple most aptly suited his need.

In using the figure of the Temple, Paul does not fail to emphasize the theme of the New Israel. It is Christ, the chief stone, who unites the diverse elements composing the Temple, through a union with Himself. He stands apart from the Sanctuary as the corner-stone, but is at the same time an integral part of the whole Temple as its determining feature.⁵ As Phythian-Adams says, "Christ is not a part but at once the whole transcendent to its parts."⁶

¹Cf. J.Y. Campbell, "Corner-stone," T.W.B.B., op. cit., p. 53.

²Corresponding to the Shekinah in the Temple (cf. Wm. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 47f.).

³Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 130. For numerous references, see B.D.B., op. cit., pp. 124f, 108f.

⁴Cf. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, op. cit., p. 152; R. Asting, op. cit., p. 206; L.S. Thornton, The Common Life..., op. cit., p. 13; Abbott, Ephesians and Colossians, op. cit., p. 76.

⁵Cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 133; Abbott, op. cit., p. 71.

⁶The People and the Presence, op. cit., p. 202.

The source of Paul's temple-typology is almost as difficult to ascertain as that of the body-concept. It may have its roots in Ezekiel's eschatological temple

2. The Corporate Tree. - Paul's most explicit reference to the tree-typology is his use of the Olive Tree to denote the continuity of the true People of God, which we have already discussed. Another incidental reference to a tree is made in Colossians 2:7, where the Church is "rooted" in Christ.¹ It is impossible to draw the full implications of an organic relationship uniting the Church with Christ such as the metaphor of the Vine and Branches does in John 15:1ff. Such an organic connection is amply brought out in the body-concept. With the same disregard of a consistent imagery which allowed the Apostle to speak of a Temple growing, this passage adds to the idea of being "rooted" that of being built up and established in Christ. This would indicate that the figures of the Temple and tree belong together.² The common denominator of these figures of growth and

(chaps. 40ff.) or other prophetic utterances regarding the restoration of the temple in the Messianic Age (cf. e.g. Zech. 14:16ff., especially vs. 21). The more immediate source however, would be the statement of Jesus calling Himself the real Temple (ναός, cf. Jn. 2:20ff., Matt. 26:61). In that case Paul's doctrine of the Body of Christ may come from this source; that is, if the conception of the Church as the corporate Temple is prior to the body-concept. But it is impossible to determine whether Jesus' statement influenced Paul's choice and use of either the figure of the body or the temple. We might profitably ask what John means when he states that the Apostolic Church understood this reference to Jesus' body as the destroyed and raised temple (cf. 2:21f.). 1) It may point to the death of Christ as the true sacrifice which fulfilled all others; therefore, the temple was no longer needed (note the allusion in the Synoptics to the rent veil). 2) It may refer to the universalization of the exclusive and local temple worship of Jerusalem in the non-exclusive and pan-geographical accessibility of the worship of God. Paul says that God no longer dwells in temples made with hands. 3) It may refer to the coming destruction of the temple, marking the end of Israel's claim to a continuity with the worship of the true People of God. N.A. Dahl says on the subject of the Temple: "Die Bildung der Gemeinde bedeutet die Aufrichtung des eschatologischen Temples (vgl. I Cor. 3:9-17; II Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:20ff.; I Pet. 2:4ff. etc.); was für Jesus eschatologische Zukunft war, ist für die Urgemeinde eschatologische Gegenwart geworden (vgl. Act. 4:11 mit Mc. 12:10f. Par.; Mc. 14:58; Joh. 2:20-22). Op. cit., p. 182.

¹In I Cor. 3:6ff. there may be a reference to organic imagery as in a tree or crop. In vs. 9, the Church is the "field of God."

²S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 133.

building is, 1) quantitative increase and geographical expansion, 2) structure.¹

3. The Lump of Dough. Paul uses a unique metaphor in describing the Church as a lump of dough. "Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as (καθώς) ye are leavened" (I Cor. 5:6f.). This metaphor in itself portrays more than any other Paul's conception of the solidarity of the Church. The sin of one member (in this case the incestuous man) implicates the whole Community. Any Jew knew that a very limited piece of leaven would corrupt any quantity of dough used in preparation of the Unleavened Bread for the feast. As the holiness of the corporate Temple² was violated through the sin of immorality (I Cor. 6:19) and the yoking of members with unbelievers (II Cor. 6:14ff.), so the purity of the dough is violated through the impurity of a member. It is the same idea which underlies Paul's warning to Timothy, "Lay hands hastily on no man, (i.e. ordain) neither be a partaker (κοινωνεῖς) of other men's sins: keep thyself pure" (I Tim. 5:22).³

¹Cf. E.L. Mascall, op. cit., pp. 120ff. Hanson suggests that αὐξεῖ may have in addition a qualitative meaning. Note also O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, op. cit., p. 32.

²R. Asting comments on this conception: "The Community is the temple of God. Through His Spirit, God is present in this temple; on account of the fact of the presence of the Spirit, this temple is a temple which is filled with God and is therefore holy. Thus, 'holy' has here a mystical, primitive content: participation in God's peculiar content of soul (Seeleninhalt)" (op. cit., p. 206; note II Sam. 6:2ff. where Uzziah violates the holiness of the Temple precincts.).

³Cf. T.A. Lacey, op. cit., pp. 247ff.

There are two other figures used to describe the Church but they have little significance. In Eph. 5:27, the Community is the sacrificial victim cleansed from any blemish and holy for presentation to God. Again the corporate holiness of the whole is the main feature. The other metaphor is the reference to the Church of Corinth as a letter (ἡ ἐπιστολή, II Cor. 3:2f.). "Ye are an epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in tables that are hearts of flesh" (vs. 3, R.V.). There is no apparent idea of solidarity involved in the use of the corporate metaphor.

Incorporation Into the Solidarity of the

New Humanity

Introduction

We must now turn to consider the question of incorporation into the fellowship ($\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$) of the New Humanity. Since the Church is the New Israel of God, it is not surprising to find that there are general features which incorporation into the New Community has in common with initiation into the Old Covenant which constituted ethnic Israel.

Paul's doctrine of the constitution of the New Humanity has two very basic propositions. 1) The first we have already discussed in connection with the question of the identification of Christ with humanity through the Incarnation, involving His incorporation into the body of flesh, sin, and death. In His representative victory over the Old Aeon, the New was given actuality. This victory was potentially the victory of the race. But this is not the whole story, for if it were, redemption would be universal and the role of the human recipient purely passive. All humanity would automatically belong to the Elect People of God; a doctrine which has manifestly little support in the New Testament.

2) The second fundamental factor in redemption embraces the medium of inclusion into the New Community through faith and baptism.¹ This involves the free choice of the individual without any violation of the corporate predestination and election of the whole People.² While the original decree of God assures the existence of the whole Community (Eph. 1:4), the gospel is preached and must be

¹Cf. W. Koester, op.cit., p. 35; C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op.cit., pp. 98f. Note the sustained emphasis of L. Newbigin, op.cit., passim.

²We cannot in this study attempt to solve the inconsistency in these opposing propositions. They are not altogether solved by Paul but it is an excellent example of his organic thinking. See L. Newbigin, op.cit., pp. 100ff.

believed for the election to find its historical fulfilment (Rom. 10:8ff.).

Now, gaining a place in the Community is not secured through merely desiring to have it; rather, "our life must be incorporated in the Saviour and His work."¹ This incorporation involves aspects which are both inward and outward,² not in a dualistic sense but in an indivisible unity. These two aspects which essentially belong to the medium of identification with Christ are faith and baptism.

Faith as the Medium of Identification

The inward identification of the initiate with Christ is realized through the acceptance of the propositions of the gospel relating to the significance of the historical Event of the life, death and resurrection of Christ. By faith, the novice makes the decision to walk according to the direction of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:9,14). While we cannot deal with the great mass of material and the features which belong to Paul's doctrine of faith, one thing cannot be emphasized out of proportion, namely, that faith, in the New Testament sense of trust in someone or something (*fiducia*), is the medium of identification with the risen Lord. By it the benefits of salvation are appropriated,³ and the living Christ is experienced. Faith is the bridge by which the Adamite passes from the dominion of sin and death to the New Aeon of life and peace with God.

Because Paul has so much to say about justification by faith, we may do well to consider his doctrine of faith as it is found in just one passage in the Epistle to the Galatians, chapter 3. In a crucial debate with the Judaizers, Paul makes explicit the necessity of faith if one is to consider himself as a member of the New Community. 1) Faith is the medium by which the true Children of Abraham are

¹N. Söderblom, The Mystery of the Cross, op.cit., p. 50.

²Cf. C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op.cit., pp. 98f.

³Cf. D. Somerville, op.cit., pp. 93f.

constituted (Gal. 3:7. Paul supports this proposition by appealing to Gen. 18:18, 12:3 in Gal. 3:8). 2) Faith is the only means by which the Holy Spirit is received; He is the real bond of the Community (vs. 14).¹ 3) Faith secures the promises (of salvation) which the Law could not do (vs. 18).² 4) Faith realistically identifies the believer with Christ; this means sharing in His righteousness and victory over the forces of the Aeon involved in justification (vvs. 23ff.; cf. Rom. 3:21ff., Eph. 2:8). 5) In lieu of this identification "we are made the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (vs. 26). So much is clear from this passage. Elsewhere Paul points to faith as the contracting medium of the New Covenant (Gal. 4:21ff.); it is the means by which Christ dwells in the hearts of the members of His Body (Eph. 3:17) and the channel of the new life which Christ offers to those who have died and risen with Him (Gal. 2:20).³

Although this list is not exhaustive, it will serve as a basis for Paul's conception of the absolute necessity of that inward relationship with its object (i.e. Christ) which faith provides. Apart from many other possibilities, when Paul speaks of faith, he stresses its importance in identifying the Community with

¹Along with this passage must be placed all those which indicate that the Holy-Spirit is given through baptism (cf. H. Lietzmann, an die Römer, op. cit., p. 66). L. Newbigin has stressed a much forgotten New Testament emphasis that it is the Holy Spirit that constitutes the Church (cf. op. cit., pp. 87ff.).

²It is more than probable that Paul is controverting the distinctive place of the Torah in Judaism with his distinctive place for faith. More explicitly faith is the displacement of the Torah just as the New Temple is the displacement of the locus of the Shekinah presence of God in the local Jewish cultic center in Jerusalem.

³In Eph. 4:13, for the Church to attain (καταντιᾶν) to the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son is to effect the completion (τέλειον) of the corporate "Man" εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The principle justifying the elimination of the natural branches of the Olive tree and the grafting in of the wild slips contrary to nature is the principle of faith (cf. L. Newbigin, op. cit., pp. 44f.).

its Lord. This factor alone sufficiently explains Paul's opposition to Judaistic legalism which gave little if any place to faith in the attainment of righteousness before God.¹ In a direct correspondence to Christ's identification with human existence through participation in human flesh, the initiate into the body of Christ is identified with the new resurrection existence through the reception of the Holy Spirit through faith. This is not a simple opposition between grace and works, but the question of participation in the life of Christ.

For the Apostle, faith is exercised in the individual's response to join the koinonia of the Elect. Since it is the Community which is the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit, it is there that grace super-abounds to the dissolution of the Old Aeon and its penalties (Rom. 5:15ff.). Through faith a union is born between Christ and the believer; incorporated into Him, redemption is given its explicit reference to the Community, therefore the term "saints" (οἱ ἅγιοι) is equivalent to "believers" (πιστοὶ) in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 1:1). By faith in Him, the Community is to reckon itself to be dead to sin (Rom. 6:11) and henceforth bears about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus (II. Cor. 4:10). "That which was ideally complete at the moment of believing was continually wrought out in the subsequent life of faith."² In faith-submission to the Lord of the Community, believers are made one with Him³ in such a way that His personality and character become theirs in the same manner in which it shared in the

¹H.St.J. Thackeray, The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op.cit., p. 85.

²C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op.cit., pp. 112f.

³Cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, St. Paul and Mystery Religions, London, 1913, p. 223; H.W. Robinson, "The Group and the Individual in Israel," op.cit., p. 168. Such faith union is the key to the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ and is not to be found in the Mystery Religions (H.A.A. Kennedy, ibid.; cf. R.N. Flew, The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology, op.cit., p. 58; L. Newbigin, op.cit., p. 43, C.R. Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Society, op.cit., p. 259).

archetypal experience of their Lord.¹ Goguel speaks of faith as a mystical phenomenon uniting the believer to Christ,² but it is more than this for it has very distinctive social implications. C.R. Smith has spoken incisively:

It is really a unique relation - transcending other social relations, ever while it is like them. The best way to approach it is to recall that Jesus chose His disciples one by one. Between Him and each Christian there is a link called 'faith.' His followers are one with each other because by 'faith' each of them is one with Him.³

Lest we be tempted to place an undue emphasis on the role of baptism as the medium of incorporation into the Body of Christ, we must recognize that Paul uses the aorist of the verb (πιστεύω) six times absolutely (cf. e.g. Rom. 13:11) and once with εἰς to denote the beginning of the Christian life, indicating that faith is the paramount factor (cf. Eph. 1:12f., 2:8f.).⁴ In reality, faith is the inward and baptism the outward or objective side of the same event.⁵ Baptism without faith is completely invalid,⁶ even as G. Johnston affirms, it is not

¹Cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, op.cit., p. 129. H.W. Robinson calls this "faith mysticism" which is the New Testament equivalent on a higher spiritual level of the ancient doctrine of corporate personality (The Cross of the Servant, op.cit., p. 84).

²The Birth Christianity, op.cit., pp. 237f.

³The Bible Doctrine of Society, op.cit., p. 258.

⁴A. Nygren well says, that πιστεύω denotes a receptive attitude to the offering of God (Agape and Eros, op.cit., p. 130).

⁵A.B. Bruce sees the function of Faith as the transmutation of the objective state of privilege into a subjective experience (St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, op.cit., p. 177). Cf. R.V.G. Tasker, op.cit., p. 88. This unity corresponds to the unity of the Incarnation, Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ even as it does to the Hebrew conception of the Unity of body and soul.

⁶R.N. Flew rightly points out that, "The chief argument against the view that ex opere operato Baptism itself effected a change in the substance of the soul is the unvarying Pauline emphasis on faith" (The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology, op.cit., p. 58). In the same vein A.M. Hunter says, "To affirm that Paul regarded baptism as the fons et origo of the new life would be to stultify all that he has to say about faith" (op.cit., p. 78). Contrast F. Prat, op.cit., I, 223 and A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op.cit., p. 23.

baptism but faith active in love (Gal. 5:6) that realizes membership in the community.¹

Faith is the New Testament fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy of the bond of the New Covenant (Jeremiah 31:33) and the promise of God through Ezekiel of the "heart of flesh" (11:19). It is a new awareness of the inward triangular relationships of the Community with its vortex in Christ, the risen Messiah, and its horizontal plane embracing the full extent of the koinonia. Faith is the perception of the eschatological nature of the Community, formed by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. By linking the believer with Christ, he is incorporated into the Messianic Age heralded by the prophets; there the new deathless order of existence is already present in moral experience.² Finally, we may add our endorsement to a statement by Bishop Newbigin: Here it is sufficient to draw attention to the overwhelming weight of argument in favour of the statement that faith is, from the human side, the constitutive fact of membership in the people of God."³

Baptism as the Outward Means of Identification with Christ

1. Introduction. - Just as Judaism required Gentile proselytes to be baptized before they were admitted into the Community of Israel, the Church followed the same practice. As an initiatory rite, baptism is mentioned only once in the Paulines.⁴ "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free" (I Cor. 12:13). Certainly to the outside

¹Op.cit., p. 89.

²Cf. R.N. Flew, The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology, op.cit., p. 58; C.H. Dodd, Romans, op.cit., p. 126; L. Newbigin, op.cit., p. 45; J. Moffatt, Paul and Paulinism, London, 1910, p. 52, correctly sees the yielding of the will (an integral element in faith) as a basic attitude in the reception of the Spirit of Christ.

³Op.cit., p. 45.

⁴H.G. Marsh, op.cit., p. 132.

world, whether among Jews or Gentiles, the Christian practice of immersion must have appeared as a conscious attempt to incorporate proselytes into a Jewish sect.¹ As such it provided a link with the Old and the New Israel.

2. Baptism as a Rite. - In Paul's conception, baptism merely as a rite, had little significance if any. In writing to the Corinthians he says that he is thankful that he did not baptize more converts than he did (1:14f. This is said because the schismatic groups were naming themselves after apostles. His commission was specifically to preach the gospel, not to baptize (vs. 17). He warns the same church that baptism is not a magical rite which can guarantee that the novice will reach the "promised land."² Just as Israel of old had its sacraments³ and historical events with spiritual significance (I Cor. 10:2), yet perished in the wilderness, so the believers of Corinth must beware of unbelief and of the accompanying pitfalls of the Congregation. Baptism of itself cannot assure anyone's escape from divine punishment (I Cor. 10:5f.; cf. Heb. 3:6ff.).⁴ Thus, it is fundamental to recognize that according to the teaching of the Apostle, true baptism is received in conjunction with the response of faith.

¹Both the baptism of John and that of the New Covenanters belonged to this category.

²Cf. A.E.J. Rawlinson, op.cit., p. 230; H.A.A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, op.cit., p. 133, n.1.

³These are in Barth's words, a representation (Abbild, Darstellung), a seal (σφραγίς) or a sign (signum), a type (Entsprechung) or a copy (μίμησις) of the spiritual reality (The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism, trans. E.A. Paine, London, 1954, pp. 13f.). See also A.M. Hunter, op.cit., p. 80 and H.A.A. Kennedy St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions, op.cit., p. 247.

⁴Cf. J. Moffatt, I Corinthians, op.cit., pp. 129f.; R.V.G. Tasker, op.cit., pp. 90f.; K. Barth, op.cit., p. 63; F.C. Baur, Paul, II, 177; A.E.J. Rawlinson, op.cit., p. 232; A.D. Nock, St. Paul, London, 1938, p. 240. Unfortunately the evidence is too inconclusive for us to penetrate the intention of Paul's reference to the Corinthian vicarious baptism for the dead (I Cor. 15:29). Did he see the bond of solidarity extending across the gulf of death or is it an argument ad hominem? See H.G. Marsh, op.cit., p. 167 and J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit., p. 54.

For Paul, the sacrament is what we might designate "faith-baptism", This is clear from Galatians 3:26f.:

For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. (R.V.).

So also Romans 10:8f.:

But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach: because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord,¹ and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

Through the confession of faith in baptism, the novice is incorporated into the new Israel; he becomes part of the New Man, that is, he is "saved" ($\sigma\omega\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$).

3. Paul's Doctrine of Baptism. - Baptism in the New Testament is aligned with a wide variety of meanings. These have been summarized by C.T. Craig:

First of all it involved a washing or cleansing (I Cor. 6:11; Acts 22:16; Rev. 22:14; Heb. 10:22), not the putting away of the filth of the flesh but the interrogation of a good conscience (I Pet. 3:21). Accompanying this washing was the forgiveness of sins (Acts. 2:38). It meant also the gift of the Spirit. 'For by one Spirit were we all baptized' (I Cor. 12:13). Occasionally in Acts the gift of the Spirit is separate from baptism (Acts 8:12, 10:47), but according to the usual view they are brought together. This meant nothing less than a new birth. We are told that it is impossible to see the kingdom of God unless a man is born of water and the Spirit (Jn. 3:5). It is therefore a washing of regeneration (Tit. 3:5-7) which brought illumination (Heb. 6:4, 10:32). Furthermore, baptism could involve 'putting on Christ', or dying and rising with Christ (Gal. 3:27; Col. 2:12; Rom. 6:4-6).²

It is clear from the references that many of these meanings have been exemplified in the Epistles of Paul. But we must more particularly notice the meanings which Paul emphasizes. One among these is the alignment of baptism with incorpora-

¹It is quite possible that Paul has in mind the baptismal confession here.

²The One Church, London, 1952, pp. 69f. It is most important to notice that in at least two instances, the gift of the Spirit which is the constituting factor in the creation or manifestation of the Church (cf. L. Newbigin, op.cit., pp. 96f.) is granted apart from Baptism, meaning that submission to the rite is not necessarily the condition for inclusion into the Body of Christ (cf. K. Barth, op.cit., pp. 23ff).

tion into the fellowship of the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 12:13, quoted above).¹

The significance of the point is noted in that it is the one Spirit which is the source of the unity of the Church even as He is the ground (Ursache) of the new life in Christ.² The vital connection which baptism has with the κοινωνία πνεύματος, "participation in the Spirit" probably arose out of the fact that the Holy Spirit was given at the Baptism of the convert.³ This point is explicitly made in Acts where Paul encounters twelve disciples previously baptized by John but who did not possess the Holy Spirit (19:1ff.). After Paul had re-baptized them and laid hands upon them, they received the gift of the Spirit (vs. 6). The New Testament clearly says that the difference between the baptism of John and that of Christ (i.e. in His name) lay in the latter's bestowing the Holy Spirit (cf. Lk. 3:16).⁴ Paul is very definitely in this tradition⁵ so that of the Church he says, "Not by works in righteousness which we did, but according to his mercy he saved us through washing (λουτροῦ) of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit whom he poured out abundantly upon us through Jesus Christ our Savior" (Tit. 3:5f.).

Baptism did confer upon the initiate the right of admission into the visible community of the Church, the Body of Christ.⁶ Since the Body is also

¹Cf. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, op.cit., p. 119, for the same conception in the Gospels and Acts.

²W. Koester, op.cit., p. 34.

³Cf. J.Y. Campbell, "Κοινωνία" and its Cognates in the New Testament, op.cit., p. 378, and H.G. Marsh, op.cit., p. 141.

⁴Cf. A.E.J. Rawlinson, op.cit., p. 233; O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, op.cit., p. 10.

⁵Cf. L. Newbigin, op.cit., p. 99. It also corresponds to the counterpart of this idea in Judaism, in which a proselyte through initiation into Israel was brought into the sphere of the Shekinah (i.e. under its wings).

⁶Cf. C.T. Craig, op.cit., pp. 70f.; A.M. Hunter, op.cit., p. 79; A.E.J. Rawlinson, op.cit., p. 227; O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, op.cit.,

the dwelling-place of the Spirit,¹ incorporation into it meant incorporation into the Spirit.² This elucidates the phrases ἐν πνεύματι "in the Spirit" (cf. I Cor. 12:13, Rom. 8:9, Gal. 3:25, I Tim. 3:16) and κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος "fellowship of the Spirit" (II Cor. 13:14 (13)). In this sense, baptism is equivalent to the immersion of the proselyte in Judaism, although the symbolism, the meaning is radically different. Speaking of baptism, H. Sahlin writes:

The Christian is consequently "in Christ." He is virtually incorporated into the body of Christ. Hence, by the Pauline formula 'to be in Christ' there is meant, strictly speaking, no kind of mystical union with Christ; it states the purely objective fact that through baptism a person has been 'planted together with Christ' (Rom. 6:5). To S. Paul this was evidently an objective reality just as it was an objective reality to Judaism that through circumcision and proselyte baptism the proselyte was admitted into the Exodus generation and becomes a partaker of its salvation.³

We must examine still more closely Paul's understanding of the implications of the ἐν βάπτισμα "one baptism" (Eph. 4:5) which embraced the undissected Event of the death and resurrection of Christ⁴ involving the βάπτισμος "baptism"

pp. 31,34; A. Nygren, Romans, op.cit., pp. 232f.; S. Hansons' presentation of Bousset's interpretation of I Cor. 12:13 (Die erste Brief an die Korinther, p. 134), op.cit., p. 75; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, op.cit., pp. 120f.; R.N. Flew, The Nature of the Church, London, 1952, p. 196. P.T. Forsyth, The Church and the Sacraments, London, 1917 (reprint 1953), pp. 43f., 53f., 61; L. Newbigin, op.cit., pp. 27,67; E. Best, op.cit., p. 16.

¹ Compare Rom. 5:5, 8:23 with Ezekiel 37:14. Cf. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, op.cit., p. 152; O. Cullmann, op.cit., p. 10.

² Cf. M. Goguel, "L'Idée d'Eglise dans le Nouveau Testament," op.cit., p. 70. Note Ireneaus, Adv. Haer, III.24.1.

³ Op.cit., p. 92. Cf. E. Best, chap. IV, passim, op.cit., pp. 65ff.

⁴ Cf. S. Hanson and the allusion to W.T. Hahn (Das Mitsrerben und Mitauferstehen mit Christus bei Paulus, Gutersloh, 1937, passim), op.cit., p. 84; O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, op.cit., p. 18. We are indebted in this section to the lectures of T.F. Torrance presented on the Sacraments in New College during the winter term, 1954-55. These lectures emphasized the eschatological character of Jesus' baptisma involving the basic elements of Water, Spirit and Blood. It is only encompassed in so comprehensive a description as Paul gives of Christ and His mission in Phil. 2:6ff., in which the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ are part of one whole.

of the individual in the Church. Two passages are paramount for this purpose; therefore we shall quote them more or less in full:

We who died (οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν) to sin, how shall we yet live in it? Or are ye ignorant that as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we have been buried with him (συνεταφήμεν αὐτῷ) through baptism into death, in order that (ἵνα) as (ὥσπερ) Christ was raised from the dead by (διὰ) the glory of the Father, even so (οὕτως) we might walk in newness of life. For if we have been united (σύνφυτοι) in the likeness (ὁμοιώματι) of his death, but also we shall be (united in the likeness) of the resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man has been crucified, in order that the body of sin might be destroyed that we should no longer be in thralldom to sin (Rom. 6:2-6).

In whom also ye have been circumcised with the circumcision enacted without hands in the putting off of the body of the flesh (cf. Rom. 2:28f.) in the circumcision of Christ, being buried with (συνταφέντες) him in the baptism, in which also you have been raised through the faith of the working of God who raised him from the dead; and you having been dead (in) the trespasses and uncircumcision of your flesh, he vitalized (συνεζωοποίησεν) with him, for giving (χαρισάμενος) us all trespasses (τὰ παραπτώματα) (Col. 2:11-13; cf. vs. 20 and 3:3, ἀπεθάνετε γάρ, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κεκρυπταὶ σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ Gal. 2:20).

In baptism, the initiate re-experienced or shared in the ἐν βαπτισμῷ of Christ through union (σύνφυτος ¹) in the likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of His death.² Thus, Paul sees the Christian proselyte bath as a purely derived event. It was the sharing in the whole Event (ἐν βαπτισμῷ) which contracted the New Covenant of the true People of God.³ But it is more than an acknowledgment of the Covenant. It has

¹This word may derive from φύω, "born together," "congenital," "grow together," or it may stem from φυτεύω "planted together." F. Prat argues that it means to share the same life principle (op.cit., I, 222f.) but Bourke's examination of usage prior and contemporary to Paul, forces him to reject any botanical associations. It means only "united with" (cf. op.cit., pp. 112ff. and especially 124). Professor Torrance maintains that both roots φύω and φυτεύω are used in grafting. Either very close union or growth together (cf. Jn. 15:1ff.) appear to be in Paul's mind.

²Cf. K. Barth, The Teaching of the Church . . ., op.cit., pp. 13, 18.

³Even as Israel was baptized in the Red Sea to receive the Old Covenant (cf. supra, pp. 108f.). According to H. Sahlin, Jesus Christ is the New Moses (the starting point is the death and resurrection of Christ) which has the same meaning for the Church as the crossing of the Red Sea had for Israel (op.cit., p. 91). See further P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge, 1948, pp. 6f. and W.J. Phythian-Adams, The People and the Presence, Oxford, 1942, pp. 184f.

also the elements of a contemporaneity of experience made so familiar to the Jewish Passover observance. Thus, what happened to Christ has through baptism happened to us (cf. Rom. 6:4 and the use of ὡς περ ... οὕτως).¹ The ὁμοίωμα the concrete reality of the redemptive Experience (suffered by Christ),² has been offered to us in such a way that by baptism, we participate in it. Thus, in Romans 6, baptism into Jesus Christ, burial with Him, grafting or union with Him, and a concrete incorporation into Him, are all embraced within the conception of baptism.

In the second passage quoted (Colossians 2:11ff.), Paul relates spiritual circumcision to baptism. It was circumcision which was the seal (σφραγίς) of Abraham's "righteousness of faith" (cf. Rom. 4:11) and Spirit-baptism is the seal (σφραγίς) of a Christian's incorporation into the New Aeon (cf. II Cor. 1:22, Eph. 1:13, 4:30).³ The general background of Paul's thought appears to be the two-fold requirement of the Gentile proselyte coming into the Jewish covenant.⁴ The differences are self-evident, however. Incorporation by faith-baptism into the New Covenant (i.e. Jesus Christ) frees one from the "flesh" and its antagonism against God; it removes one from the Old Aeon and places him in the New Age,⁵

¹Cf. further S. Hanson, op.cit., p. 85.

² ὁμοίωμα signifies much more than mere likeness (cf. Rom. 5:14, Phil. 2:7 where it means the "concrete embodiment" of our humanity) and is to be contrasted with ὁμοιότης.

³Cf. O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, op.cit., pp. 45ff.

⁴That is, baptism and circumcision. As the Jewish proselyte became one with Israel crossing the Red Sea, so the baptized becomes one with Christ's death and resurrection (H. Sahlin, op.cit., p. 91; cf. p. 84; A. Raymond George, op.cit., pp. 162ff.). Baptism removed the filth and uncleanness of Gentile associations and idolatry (including the filth of the Serpent); in Christian baptism, the Church has been freed from πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα (Col. 2:13) through incorporation into the New Covenant through the circumcision of Christ, that is His death for it. Because baptism is the symbol of the death and resurrection of Christ, the seal of circumcision has been displaced. Circumcision in the New Age, becomes for Paul, the symbol of trusting in the flesh which has no part in the attainment of the salvation which is purely of grace (see L. Newbigin's excellent discussion, op.cit., pp. 36ff.).

⁵Cf. E.H. Wahlstrom, op.cit., p. 17; J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit., pp. 79f.

inaugurated by Christ and mediated through the Holy Spirit.¹ Therefore, "those that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh and its lusts. If we live in the Spirit, by the Spirit let us walk" (Gal. 5:24f.).

In another passage in the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul states: "For as many of you as have been baptized into (εἰς)² Christ, have put on (ἐνεδύσασθε) Christ" (3:27). This is another reference to the counterpart of the putting off "the body of the flesh" (Col. 2:11).³ The corporate clothing of the two opposing communities (i.e. "flesh" and "Spirit" of "Body or Christ") is a witness of its unity (cf. Gal. 3:28). O. Cullmann remarks well:

The connection of the two texts Rom. 6:3ff and I Cor. 12:13 is not arbitrary. An inner bond exists between them, in so far as the Body of Christ into which we are baptised is at the same time the crucified body of Christ (Col. 1:24, II Cor. 1:5, I Pet. 4:3) and his resurrected body (I Cor. 15:20-22). On the basis of a like connection of thought between death and resurrection with Christ on the one hand, and the building up of a community of Christ on the other hand, Paul in Gal. 3:27-28 ... says also: 'as many of you as have been baptised into Christ ... have put on Christ ... ye are all one in Christ.'⁴

In Ephesians 5:26, Paul again refers to the whole Church: "even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing (τῷ λουτρῷ, "laver") of water by the word (ἐν ῥήματι) ...". In his favorite way, Paul posits the corporate character of baptism.⁵

¹Cf. W. Koester, op.cit., pp. 36f.; K. Barth, The Teaching of the Church, ... op.cit., p. 12; A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op.cit., p. 119; H.A.A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, op.cit., p. 148.

²S. Hanson argues cogently for the local interpretation of εἰς when it refers to baptism in the Epistles, in the sense of incorporation into the personal representative sphere of Christ (I Cor. 1:13,15). Op.cit., p. 81. See J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit., p. 62.

³Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit., pp. 63.f.

⁴Baptism in the New Testament, op.cit., pp. 30f.

⁵Cf. C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op.cit., p. 118. See the proper emphasis of K. Barth, The Teaching of the Church..., op.cit., pp. 31f., "In principle baptism cannot be celebrated as a private act ..." Cf. C. Chavasse, op.cit., p. 105.

The baptism of Christ, the baptism of the Church, and the baptism of the individual believer are one transcendent reality. Baptism includes one in the sphere of the corporate personality of Christ. This in turn produces His character manifested in His cleansed Body. This is the New Man in which all disunity of race, creed, and position is obviated (Gal. 3:28).¹ The Body, through baptism shares in the obedient sacrifice of Christ and realistically experiences the revitalization of the risen Lord. This point has been well made by T.F. Torrance:

To be baptised is to be planted into that judgment, to be engrafted into the Body of death, inserted into the sphere of union where judgment and crucifixion are enacted as saving operation. It is therefore through baptismal incorporation into Christ that our sinful divisions are brought under mortification of the Cross and are destroyed in Christ. If through this Baptism the Church participates in that action for it, is sacramentally incorporated into the one Body of Christ, then Baptism is the primary enactment and expression of the oneness of the Church.²

Because baptism is into (εἰς) Jesus Christ (Rom. 6:3f.), it is incorporation into His name.³ It is He that is gathering the sealed community of those "who name the name of the Lord" (II Tim. 2:19). By this is meant no less than incorporation into the family of Christ, the household of faith, which is the sphere of the Lordship of Christ (i.e. where He is baal). As such it offers both privilege and obligation,⁴ just as the ancient Semitic kin-group did within its social structure. Neither the use of the "name" (i.e. Jesus Christ) nor the involuntary baptism of Israel into Moses (εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν) in the Red Sea (I Cor. 10:2) are examples of primitive magic. On the contrary, it is inclusion into the

¹Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op.cit., p. 118.

²The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church, Edinburgh, 1954, p. 22; cf. F. Prat, op.cit., II, 298.

³P.G.S. Hopwood, op.cit., pp. 284f. Cf. A.E.J. Rawlinson, op.cit., p. 234. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, op.cit., p. 119; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, op.cit., I, 138. It is equivalent to the name of יהוה upon Israel (Num. 6:27); cf. F. Gavin, op.cit., p. 68; A.M. Hunter, op.cit., p. 83.

⁴Cf. K. Barth, The Teaching of the Church.., op.cit., p. 33.

representative sphere of a leader, whether it be Christ or Moses.¹ "They had become Moses' people and the obligation was imposed upon them not in consequence of any ceremonial but because they had participated in the supernatural deliverance."² Besides this it concerned the act of grace in which God made a covenant with His people.³ In the redemption of the New Israel from the Old Aeon, the New Exodus had taken place, but at the same time it brought the Community into the corporate sphere of the New Moses.

4. Summary and Conclusion. - The core of Paul's conception of the meaning of baptism is a realistic experiencing of the death and resurrection of Christ. Through baptism the initiate shares in the penalty paid for sin as he bows in vital union with Christ to receive the judgment of God.⁴ This penalty is death, the universal judgment of God upon all transgression (cf. Col. 2:20). Out of death, God re-creates through His power and for His glory (δόξα in Rom. 6:4) the New Man through the infusion of the resurrection life of Christ mediated through the Holy Spirit (cf. I Tim. 6:13 ... τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα).

¹Cf. S. Hanson, op.cit., p. 81.

²C.A.A. Scott, op.cit., p. 116 (italics ours). Cf. Wm. Manson, "The Biblical Doctrine of Mission," op.cit., p. 259.

³J.A.T. Robinson has convincingly treated the relationship of various prepositional phrases (e.g. "in Christ", "with Christ", "through Christ") used by Paul, to elucidate the conception of the identification of the believer with Christ through baptism. "Now all of these phrases depend for their understanding on a single assumption and mean nothing without it. It is the assumption that Christians have died in, with and through the crucified body of the Lord ... because, they are now in and of His body in the 'life that he liveth unto God, viz., the body of the Church. It is only by baptism into Christ, that is 'into (the) one body' (I Cor. 12:13), only by an actual 'participation in the body of Christ' (I Cor. 10:16, R.V.M.), that a man can be saved through His body on the cross." (op.cit., pp. 46f.).

⁴Cf. K. Barth, The Teaching of the Church..., op.cit., pp. 21, 55f. Professor Torrance speaks of baptism as the sacrament in which we step out of our inadequacy into Him. He gives us repentance, brings us to obedience; He is our acquiescence to God.

Thus, the ἐν βάπτισμα corresponds to the one transgression (ἐν παράπτωμα)¹. The βάπτισμος of the believer in faith is the vindication of the extension of the reward of God offered for the one archetypal act of obedience since we share in it (cf. II Cor. 5:14), just as we formerly shared in the corporate judgment of God on the disobedience of Adam and vindicated it through our individual sinning. The new life also counteracts the destructive powers of the Aeon, freeing the initiate from any bond (Verbindlichkeit) with sin.² So also is all condemnation absolved for those who are in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:1; cf. 5:16). There is also included the deliverance from "this evil age" (Gal. 1:4). Paul's doctrine of baptism is summed up in one passage: "Faithful is the saying: For if we died (συνάπεθανομεν) together (with him) we shall live together: if we endure we shall reign together (with him)" (II Tim. 2:11ff.).

The Eucharist as Communal Fellowship

In Paul's Epistles, the Lord's Supper is largely governed by corporate considerations.³ It is fundamental to the life of the Church as a means of maintaining the awareness of the psychic unity originally constituted through faith-baptism. This unity is described as a participation in⁴ and fellowship

¹If this conclusion is correct, it is not merely coincidental that Rom. 6:1ff. follows Rom. 5:12ff.

²W. Koester, *op.cit.*, p. 39; cf. C. Weizsäcker, *op.cit.*, I, 169f. This release from sin must be apprehended by the will in faith (cf. Rom. 6:6 with vs. 11). The Christian's task is: "Werde was Du bist."

³Cf. C. Chavasse, *op.cit.*, p. 108.

⁴Cf. L.H. Seesemann, *Der Begriff κοινωνία im Neuen Testament*, Giessen, 1933, pp. 4, 34 (note that he refers to I Cor. 10:16, 1:9, II Cor. 13:13, 8:4, Phil. 1:5, 3:10, Philemon 6, as examples of an Anteilhaben, Teilnahme). See also J.Y. Campbell, "Κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament", *op.cit.*, *passim*. The realism of the idea of participation or sharing is obvious in the series of synonyms used for κοινωνία in II Cor. 6:14ff., μετοχή, κοινωνία, συμφώνησις μερίς, συγκατάθεσις.

with¹ the Head of the Redeemed Community. Regarding the need for this fellowship, F.J. Hort has well said: "All life in the higher sense depends on some fellowship, an isolated life is a contradiction of terms."² Fellowship is to the higher spiritual life what food is to the natural life.

Two passages are particularly important for our understanding of Paul's conception of the Eucharist:

1) The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not participation (κοινωνία) in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation (κοινωνία) in the body of Christ. Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf³ (ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα ὅι πολλοί ἐσμεν· οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν (I Cor. 10:16f.)).

In this same passage, Paul continued his argument with the postulation that participation in the sacrifices of Gentile idol worship mediates a communion with demons. Participation in the Eucharist of the Lord and in the "table of demons" is mutually exclusive.

Paul is apparently thinking in terms of a psychic relationship made familiar in the Old Testament conception of solidarity. Thus, the Jewish priest through his close association with the altar (vs. 18) partakes of the holiness of the altar (cf. Matt. 23:16ff.).⁴ The pagans in their heathen sacrifices join in a partnership with demons. The Christian Community, in the same way, does not

¹Cf. L.H. Seesemann, op.cit., pp. 86ff. It is a religious term for Paul (ibid., p. 99). G.V. Jourdan says, "Christ-fellowship was common to the whole church wherein 'share-giving' was one with 'share-receiving' (op.cit., p. 114). Jourdan continues, "In the one comprehensive term κοινωνία Paul has united all the ideas and expressions which designate the relationship of the Christian to Christ - a 'sharing-together' in the past sufferings, present fellowship and future glory of Christ" (op.cit., pp. 123f.).

²The Way the Truth the Life, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 1894. p. 194.

³Against R.V. and A.V. It does not mean that the Church is one loaf (cf. L.S. Thornton, op.cit., p. 335).

⁴Cf. C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op.cit., p. 185. This holiness, of course, comes from God to whom the altar belongs.

partake of the actual body and Blood (cf. II. Sam. 23:17) of Christ,¹ but in a sacramental way is brought into a *κοινωνία* relationship with one another and with Christ. The contradiction between the fellowship of Christ and that of demons was self-evident to Paul² and is reminiscent of the gulf separating Israel from the idolatrous Gentiles. To join in the heathen liturgical worship is the very essence of the return to the Old Aeon and its slavery to demonic forces. But the *κοινωνία* of the body and blood of Christ conveys the conception of a "vital relation with Christ Himself as the Crucified Saviour."³

The meal is a commemorative representation of the sacrifice by which Christ inaugurated the New Covenant which constituted the New Israel. As such it is a confession of the covenant bond which makes the Community the People of God, while at the same time it produces a fellowship among those who partake of the elements in common.⁴

2) The second passage of vital concern to us is I Corinthians 11:23ff.:

¹Cf. J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 641; W. Morgan, *op. cit.*, pp. 222f., N. Micklem, *A First Century Letter*, London, 1921, pp. 64ff. As J. Jeremias says, "Eating together implies equality of position" (*The Parables of Jesus*, trans. 3rd G. ed., S.H. Hooke, London, 1954, p. 49 n.10), and provides the basis of *κοινωνία* as share-giving and share-receiving.

²Cf. A.E.J. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

³V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, London, 1937, p. 211.

⁴It is doubtful whether A.M. Hunter is correct in saying that "we see here the beginning of a tendency 'to regard the elements of the meal as a representation of the elements of the person which the concepts 'body' and 'blood' in the words of the Institution recall'" (*op. cit.*, p. 93, including a quotation from Behm, "κλάω" (T.W.N.T., *op. cit.*). It is not the elements of the person which is in mind but identification with the event of the death and resurrection of Christ. This brings one into awareness of the *κοινωνία* which ideally already exists in lieu of the common possession of the Holy Spirit. For this reason it is primarily a meal of commemoration (cf. I Cor. 11:24 and 25).

... The Lord Jesus, in the night in which he was betrayed (or delivered up) took bread and after blessing it broke (it) and said: τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. This do in my remembrance (εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναμνήσιν). So also the cup, after dinner, saying, this cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as you drink (of it) in my remembrance. For as often as you eat this bread and you drink this cup, you proclaim (καταγγέλλετε) the death of the Lord until He come. Wherefore whoever eats this bread or drinks this cup of the Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty (ἐνοχὸς ἔσται) of the body and of the blood of the Lord.¹

In this passage the solidarity of the New Humanity as the σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ is paramount. Some of the Corinthian Christians by their selfish practices despised (καταφρονεῖτε) the Ecclesia of God (vs. 22). Later, Paul, warns the assembly: "... He that eateth and drinketh (unworthily), eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself not discerning the Body (of Christ) (μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα)" (vs. 29). As W.D. Davies has said:

Here he refers to those who in their conduct at the Holy Communion forgot their unity with their fellow Christians and with Christ, who failed to recognize that to partake in the Lord's Supper was not merely to participate in Christ but also in their fellow Christians who are one with Christ.²

Thus, it is not the sacrament which is itself holy, but the unity of the Body.³ To violate it is to bring condemnation upon one's self.

¹We have already commented briefly on the controversy centering on the nature of the original institution of the Eucharist. G.D. Kilpatrick (op. cit., p. 6) maintains correctly that the Meal as a Kiddush or Haburah has a counterpart in Old Testament (Gen. 14:18; cf. Ps. 103:15 LXX. Note S.A. Cook, Cambridge Ancient History, op. cit., p. 449). Kilpatrick argues that the meal mentioned in the Prayer of Asenath destroys Jeremias' contention that there is no alternative to the view of the Last Supper as a Passover celebration found in contemporary Judaism. The omission of the references to such a practice by the Rabbis may be due to the similarity it had to the Mysteries and to the central role which the Eucharist came to have in Christianity (op. cit., pp. 6f.). R.N. Flew, speaking of the Haburah points out that it is mentioned in Peshachim (tractate 7.3,13) "to describe the group of friends who might unite to celebrate the Passover feast in common" (Jesus and His Church, op. cit., p. 110), suggesting that the two conceptions of the Supper are not necessarily exclusive.

²Op. cit., p. 55.

³This is the same point as we have emphasized relative to the violation of the holiness of the corporate Temple in I Cor. 3 (see above).

It is preferable to see Paul's conception of the unity of the Church as covenantal¹ and experienced personally,² rather than sacramental.³ It is a solidarity which corresponds to the corporate personality of Israel, even though the bond is the living *κοινωνία* of the Holy Spirit. It is He, as He extends the character and personality of Christ, who creates the solidarity of the New Humanity.⁴ It is for this reason that Paul speaks of the guilt of despising Christ when one pays no heed to the unity of the Community which bears His name. To sin against the Community is therefore to sin against the Lord of the Community who constitutes the basis of its unity. (I Cor. 8:12).⁵ As Christ is present and alive in the members of His Body, the celebration of the Eucharist is the repeated witness to and confession of the presence of Christ within the Church.⁶

¹Cf. O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, op. cit., p. 53. In that sense it is the fulfilment of the prophetic New Covenant, "a covenant by which He will break down every barrier that separates His people from Him in the truest fellowship" (G.S. Duncan, Jesus Son of Man, op. cit., p. 234).

²Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 119. G. Aulen correctly cautions us to see more than "contemporaneity" in the sense of two individuals existing at the same time. But according to Paul, that when we have grown together with Christ we no longer have independent existence (This Is the Church, ed. A. Nygren and G. Aulen, Philadelphia 1952, p. 11).

³As over against the opinion of H. Weinel, op. cit., p. 331; cf. S. Hanson, op. cit., p. 89; A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, op. cit., p. 21 and J.A.T. Robinson, "In so far then as the Christian community feeds on this body and blood, it becomes the very life and personality of the risen Christ" (op. cit., p. 57). These views bring Paul too close to the Mystery-cults where the performance of physical acts produced spiritual results (cf. C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, op. cit., p. 119).

⁴Cf. H.G. Marsh, op. cit., p. 132.

⁵See J.A.T. Robinson on Acts 26:14f., op. cit., p. 58. Contrast A.E.J. Rawlinson who thinks Paul's conception of the Eucharist is "superstitious" (op. cit., p. 230; cf. H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, op. cit., pp. 124f.).

⁶Cf. G.S. Duncan, Jesus Son of Man, op. cit., p. 231.

But this common sharing of the life of Christ through the Holy Spirit in no sense destroys the individuality of its members which maintain full responsibility and value as the objects of Christ's redeeming love.¹ As it was in the case of the solidarity of Israel in the Old Testament and Judaism, Paul maintains the priority of the Community and the subordination of the member in love for and responsibility to the whole (cf. Col. 2:19 R.V., I Cor. 12:14ff.). "It implies a new kind of individual, but one who like the true Israelite of old, could never be divorced from his social relationship."² It is not mystical absorption but "identity with difference,"³ a corporate personality "in which the individual loses himself in some larger entity, to discover himself again on a higher level."⁴ It is the heightening of the Jewish conception of the unity of Israel in which the suffering of a member or his sin were not private affairs, but reacted on the whole (I Cor. 12: 26).⁵ In other words, the bond of the Community is love in the deepest sense.⁶ It is just as R.N. Flew says:

¹E.C. Rust, op. cit., p. 116. "To the Hebrew individuality is not in the least endangered by saying that, as *κόμα*, man is 'part of one stupendous whole!'. In fact Paul deliberately substitutes a new solidarity for the old (the 'body' of creation), without in any way undermining the fact of individuality" (J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 79.n.1).

²H.W. Robinson, "The Group and the Individual in Israel," op. cit., p. 169.

³Cf. Wm. Robinson, op. cit., p. 108.

⁴H.W. Robinson, The Cross of the Servant, op. cit., p. 79; cf. L.S. Thornton, The Incarnate Lord, op. cit., pp. 51f., 60f.

⁵Cf. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life ..., op. cit., p. 36.

⁶Cf. F.R. Barry, Christianity and Psychology, 5th ed., London, 1933, pp. 286f.; E. Brunner, Man in Revolt, op. cit., pp. 290f.; J. Bright, op. cit., p. 263; C.H. Dodd, The Communion of Saints, op. cit., p. 17; T.A. Lacey, op. cit., pp. 171f.; C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, op. cit., p. 206.

Love implies a society: 'Above all put on love, for love gives cohesion to the perfect life (ὅτι ὁ ἀγαπᾷς τὴν τελειότητα). The meaning here (Col. 3:14) is probably the perfect fellowship that ought to exist among Christian men. Love is the bond that united them in a common service.¹

Lack of love, by the same token, destroys the society, and denies the reality of the Lord who is its constituting Head.

In conclusion and summary, we may say that the object of the Supper is twofold. It creates a realization of the solidarity of the members within the Body even as it produces fellowship with Christ, the Head of the Body.² This koinonia is the realistic bond of the Community³ and corresponds to the psychic bond pervading the Hebrew-kin-group as well as Israel as a whole.

The Last Supper, like baptism, applies the Jewish principles of identification with the Person of Jesus Christ, and contemporaneity, by which the participant realistically re-experienced the redemptive events which instituted the New Covenantal relationship with God.⁴ There is no real value in it apart from this participation in the realities which the symbols of the Supper represent.⁵ The main difference between the Jewish Passover and the Eucharist, is found in the eschatological character of the New Covenant and the participation of the New Humanity in the "powers of the age to come" (Phil. 3:10) through the Holy Spirit. In the commemorative Meal the Community confesses and shares in the spiritual

¹The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology, London, 1934, p. 70.

²Cf. A.M. Hunter, op.cit., p. 95; C.A.A. Scott, op.cit., p. 196; O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, op.cit., pp. 238ff., especially p. 242; W. Morgan, op.cit., p. 213; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, op.cit., p. 124.

³Cf. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, op.cit., p. 110.

⁴Cf. A. Raymond George, op.cit., pp. 163f. This author suggests that this identification led to the συν-compounds and developed into the expression "in Christ."

⁵Note that it is the Jewish son who fails to re-experience contemporaneously the Exodus redemption (one might say, believe it personally) that is barred from the Jewish Communion (cf. supra pp. 117f.).

benefits which the historical sacrificial death of Christ had provided as well as in the solidarity conferred upon the Community through the communication of the life of the risen Christ through the Holy Spirit.¹ It is in the Eucharistic Meal that the assembly witnesses to and becomes a "corporate personality."² It is for this reason that the members of the Community who fail to show love to other members are violently judged by God for they attack the very essence of its constitution in denying its unity.

Early Judaism is omitted from Paul's Epistles. Particularly good examples are found in Paul's deductions regarding corporate blessing or merit and corporate punishment or demerit. It is because Christ is a member of the group (albeit a chief member) that He can represent that group, acting in and as a corporate personality. This is the basis of Paul's doctrine of atonement and redemption (cf. e.g. Rom. 3:25, 5:12, 10:4, II Cor. 5:14, 21). We need not repeat what is self-evident, namely, that the foundational background of this view is the characteristic Hebrew conception of man as more than an individual.³ His actions are not private; his life is bound up in the bundle of life common to all men.

Equally important to Paul's conceptions of the solidarity of the race is the idea of an exclusive relationship within the totality of men. This totality is the counterpart to the Israel of old who were the elect people of God, united to Him by a common covenant. In Paul, the primary conception of the solidarity through the covenant is displaced by the solidarity mediated through a personal relationship to the risen Christ, who is Himself the covenant of the New Israel.

A third fundamental point which must be taken into account is that for

¹Cf. further G.S. Duncan, Jesus Son of Man, op.cit., pp. 234f.

²See J. Weiss (op.cit., p. 640) and allusion to W.R. Smith. Cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, op.cit., pp. 150, 152.

For J.S. Stewart, A Key to Christ, op.cit., p. 165.

Conclusion

Although we have made an attempt to indicate a number of points where the conceptions of the solidarity of the race evinced by Paul correspond to those found in the Old Testament and Early Judaism, we must make a cursory assessment of a few general as well as specific conclusions.

We may say at the outset that not a single major conception or implication of solidarity found in either the Old Testament or Early Judaism is omitted from Paul's Epistles. Particularly good examples are found in Paul's deductions regarding corporate blessing or merit and corporate punishment or demerit. It is because Christ is a member of the group (albeit a chief Member) that He can represent that group, acting in and as a corporate personality. This is the basis of Paul's doctrine of atonement and redemption (cf. e.g. Rom. 3:25, 5:15, 18f., II Cor. 5:14, 21). We need not repeat what is self-evident, namely, that the foundational background of this view is the characteristic Hebrew conception of man as more than an individual.¹ His actions are not private; his life is bound up in the bundle of life common to all men.²

Equally important to Paul's conceptions of the solidarity of the race is the idea of an exclusive relationship within the totality of men. This totality is the counterpart to the Israel of old who were the elect people of God, united to Him by a common covenant. In Paul, the primary conception of the solidarity through the covenant is displaced by the solidarity mediated through a personal relationship to the risen Christ, who is Himself the covenant of the New Israel.

A third fundamental point which must be taken into account is that for

¹C.R. Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Man, op.cit., pp. 218, 272, 274. Cf. A. Nygren, "Christ and the Forces of Destruction," op.cit., p. 373; H.W. Robinson, The Cross of the Servant, op.cit., p. 85.

²Cf. J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, op.cit., p. 165.

Paul, the Messianic Age had dawned. This meant simply that the myriad expectations originating in the early prophets and expended by apocalyptic and Rabbinic speculation had found, or soon would find, their fulfilment in the re-gathered Israel. The expected attributes of unity and holiness play an important part in Paul's doctrine of the Church which is the New Israel. There must be no division or schism in the Israel within the Messianic Age to be a counterpart to the sects of Judaism. Of course, there were many other implications, such as the giving of the Holy Spirit "poured out upon all flesh" and the inauguration of the reign of the Davidic Messiah (Col. 1:13, I Cor. 15:24ff.).¹ We need not point again to the references to the Messianic figures which Paul uses to describe Christ. These basically indicate Paul's conception of the solidarity of the Church through its relationship to Christ. This involves the principles of realistic representation, oscillation, vicarious substitution, and so on.

Paul, just as the Jewish teachers, used metaphors and symbols to describe the solidarity of the Church. The metaphors need not be the same ones, but the point was the same; a mysterious unity pervaded the Elect Race so that the action of a member or a group implicated the whole in reward or punishment. In Paul these metaphors are often organic (i.e. a body, tree,) because it is the organic structure which best describes the implications of solidarity; therefore Paul says, "And whether one member suffereth, all members suffer with it; or

¹One may well ask why Paul's references to the Kingdom are so limited. H. A. A. Kennedy suggests, "... we are not unduly pressing the data when we assert that for Paul the conception of the Family of God, as established and knit together in Christ takes the place of the Kingdom" (Theology of the Epistles, op.cit., p. 106; so also Wm. Robinson, op.cit., p. 50; cf. A. G. Hebert, The Throne of David, op.cit., p. 138). But R. N. Flew is not impressed: "The Church is not to be identified with God's Kingly Rule. Neither is it a conception substituted for that of the kingdom in the later writings of the New Testament" (Jesus and His Church, op.cit., p. 24). I Cor. 15:24ff., indicates that Paul looks forward to the Kingdom although it does exist at present in Col. 1:13. It may be another example of the tension between the present intermediate condition and that which is yet to come.

one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it" (I Cor. 12:26).

Besides this, there are the ideas of contemporaneity, and realistic identification in the experiences of another. These are so clear that we need say no more. Rather than mediation of experience through sharing in the life of the ancestor(s), the Christian shared in the experiences of redemption through faith¹ and the mediated life of Christ through the Holy Spirit. In the place of the Passover, the Christian Community celebrated the Eucharistic Supper as a realistic commemorative sharing in the death of Christ. The initiatory rite of baptism in the same manner as proselyte immersion brought the convert into the visible fellowship of the People of God. In baptism, one shared in the death and resurrection of Christ and received "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:2; cf. Gal. 6:2).

When all is said and done, it is the Church as the "household of God" (Eph. 2:19) or the "household of faith" (Gal. 6:10) which most distinctively shows the relationship of Paul to his own background. It is the Community as a family, the "sons of God" which stands over against the Adamic kin-group who are the "sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2). Solidarity in both Judaism and the Old Testament is based upon relationship. We noted the conception of Israel

¹In our discussion of the place that Paul gives to faith in role of identification with Christ, we stated that there was little emphasis on faith in Judaism. While this is true, R. Eleazar b. 'Arakh said, "Be watchful in the study of the Torah and know what answer to give to the unbeliever" (P. Aboth, 2.14; A. Büchler, op.cit., p. 55). H. St. J. Thackeray points to I Macc. 2:52, Ἀβραάμ οὐκ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὐρέθη πιστός, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ δικαιοσύνη (cf. Ecclus. 44:20) as the Jewish counterpart to Paul's emphasis on faith - but this faith corresponds more to a work (The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, op.cit., p. 91) rather than to identification or incorporation into Christ. It is of more significance to note that the Covenanters explained Habbakuk 2:4 to be a reference to the faith placed in the Master, the divine founder of the New Covenant, which saves the believer. He has been taken away, but His faithful ones intimately united within the 'party' remained grouped together in the Community which he himself instituted (cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, op.cit., p. 44).

а ппзвн.

Paul took this concept of brotherhood within the household most seriously.¹ He admonishes a member of the Community to abstain from any harmless practice such as the eating of meat if by doing so he should offend a weaker brother (Rom. 14:15, I Cor. 8:11ff.). Just as one helps another within the family relationship, so the Christian brotherhood must bear one another's burdens and restore him who has been overtaken in a fault (Gal. 6:1f.). Adoption into the Christian Family transcends the social distinctions between a master and his slave; therefore, Paul enjoins Philemon to receive Onesimus, "a brother beloved in the Lord" even as he would receive Paul himself (vvs. 16f.). For the same reason, slaves are not to dishonor their Christian masters, "because they are brethren" (I Tim. 1:1f.). The mutual love and regard within the family corresponds to the mutual regard which the members of the body have for each other (I Cor. 12:14ff.). This mutual concern for one another within the Family is summed up in Paul's varied use of agape. Deissmann appropriately calls I Corinthians 13, "the Son of Songs on brotherly love."²

As it was in the psychic unity of the Hebrew family, the members were implicated for good or for evil in the actions of another member, and especially the head of the family. This conception is amplified in the Epistles:

For as the sufferings of Christ abound unto us, even so our comfort also aboundeth through Christ. But whether we are afflicted it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we are comforted, it is for your comfort, which worketh in the patient enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer: and our hope for you is

¹A. Deissmann, op. cit., p. 209.

²Ibid., p. 210.

stedfast; knowing that, as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so also are ye of the comfort ... (II Cor. 1:5ff. R.V.).¹

The sufferings of Christ overflow into the life of the apostolic emissary; sufferings which are endured for the sake of (ὕπερ) the church of Colossae (1:24). This common sharing in the corporate suffering of the Family is well illustrated in the letter to Timothy:

Therefore I endure all things ^{for} the elect's sake, that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. Faithful is the saying: For if we died with him, we shall also live with him: if we endure, we shall also reign with him ... (II Tim. 2:10ff.).

This suffering with Christ guarantees reigning with Him in His glory (Rom. 8:17); therefore, Paul seeks to experience "the κατασμία of his (Christ's) sufferings" (Phil. 3:10).²

What is true of suffering within the Family, is also true of the holiness of the Community. It is a corporate ethical and psychic quality characterizing the People of God. Within the family the sin of a member is a direct violation of the corporate holiness of the group, issuing in the corporate judgment of the Church (cf. e.g. I Cor. 5 passim, 3:16f., 11:27ff.). In this chapter, of course, Paul is seen to be applying the corporate reward rather than corporate justice, but both ideas are thoroughly Jewish.

We must examine Paul's conception of the Lordship of Christ more closely within the context of his conception of the Church as the "household of God." As the New Israel acquired the title "sons of God" through adoption into the divine Sonship of Christ,³ so the brotherhood of members within the household is a derived relationship through Christ, the Elder Brother (Rom. 8:17, Gal. 4:5,

¹Cf. L. S. Thornton, The Common Life..., op.cit., pp. 35f.

²Cf. H. W. Robinson, The Cross of the Servant, op.cit., pp. 79f.

³Cf. Phythian-Adams, The People and the Presence, op.cit., pp. 187f.

Eph. 1:5, cf. Heb. 2:11ff.). As the chief member of the family, Christ is the Lord (i.e. baal) of the household.¹ This idea of the Headship or Lordship of Christ is indicated even more indirectly through the designation of the Church as the Bride ("But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of Christ is God" is spoken in the context of this conception, I Cor. 11:3). In the Semitic conception of the family, the wife and minors were accorded a more or less equal status under the father and husband who was the baal. He most realistically incorporated them in himself; he was the sole cause for their existence, at once the absolute authority and provider for the family. It is this general sphere of thought which governs Paul's doctrine of Christ as the Head of the Body in distinction to His role as King over the whole creation (I Cor. 15:25).

We have already noted that although Ephesians and Colossians distinguish the Head from the Body while the earlier Epistles identify Christ with the Body, there is no fundamental contradiction involved. Both of them must be interpreted in the light of the designation of the Church as the Bride, the Second Eve.² What is more, it is basic to the postulation that Christ is the Head of the Body to realize that Paul is thinking of either a husband-wife or father-family relationship, rather than the head as the superior organ in the body which is the seat of direction for the members.³ The Head is the exalted member of the

¹The significance of this point is brought into relief when we remember that the earliest Christian confession or creed was "Jesus is Lord" (cf. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, op.cit., p. 118).

²Contrast J. Armitage Robinson (op.cit., p. 103) who is of the opinion that the newness of the thought of human unity realized through Christ is responsible for this vacillation between opposing conceptions.

³Cf. Josephus, Wars (bk. 3.54; Loeb Cl. Lib. ed., Vol. II, 592). Jerusalem dominates the neighbourhood ὡς περ ἡ κεφαλὴ τὸ σώματος. This point is clear from the fact that science had not advanced far enough to posit the theory that the brain was the seat of the mind (infra Appendix A). This makes a point penned

Body only because it is higher, not because it rules over the other members through mental directives (note that in I Cor. 12:21-27, the head is but one member among others).

Once we recognize that the baal relationship of the chief member of the Family is what Paul is saying concerning the idea of the Head over the Body, a two-fold emphasis emerges: 1) the complete subordination of the Community under Christ,¹ 2) a vital relationship of Christ to the Family as the one who penetrates it and nourishes it.² In designating Christ as the Head, Paul gathers together the whole complex of the Semitic idea of corporate personality centering in the chief member of the group, whether, priest, king, ancestor, or a lowly baal over his $\Pi\eta\lambda\psi\eta$.

For this reason, the head, for Paul, is the center of subjection in unity.³ Those who beguile the Colossian Christians through Gnostic teachings do not hold themselves to the Head, "from which the whole body, being supported and held together by joints and ligaments, goes forward in the growth of God" (Col. 2:18f.; cf. Eph. 4:16). In a similar way, the Ephesian assembly is warned of the craftiness of erroneous teachers who masquerade as the "gifts" proffered to the Church, but destroy the unity of the faith (4:10ff.). On the contrary, the

by A.M. Fairbairn beside the issue. Paul describes Christ as the Head of the Body because "... without the Head the body would have no ideas to translate into realities" (Studies in Religion and Theology, London, 1910, p. 429). His explanation for Paul's choice of the metaphor of the body is better. "It is not because it is one, though its members are a multitude - the figure in this sense is old, much older than Paul - but because there is no other way in which an invisible Head can still seem to live and be active among men" (ibid.).

¹Cf. Eph. 1:22f., 5:23,33. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, op.cit., pp. 121f.; Grossouw, op.cit., p. 131; C.A.A. Scott, The Fellowship of the Spirit, op.cit., p. 71.

²R. Asting, op.cit., p. 212. This writer correctly notes that Ephesians and Colossians do not think of the Body as an organism but in its relationship to Christ (ibid.). Cf. G. Auden, This is the Church, ed. A. Nygren and G. Aulen, Philadelphia, 1952, p. 10.

³Cf. T. Soiron, op.cit., p. 19.

Body must grow up into Him in all things, that is, Christ, who is the Head (4:15).¹ This brings us to the enigmatic use of the term pleroma, "fulness". In the controversial meaning of Ephesians 1:23, the most favorable interpretation takes πληρουμένου in the active sense² (cf. Col. 1:24). That is, just as Christ is filled with the fulness of God, His Father, so the Church, His Body is filled with the fulness of Christ³ (cf. Eph. 4:10; it is Christ Who fills all⁴). The Epistles never indicate the meaning or content of the term pleroma. This may be due to the breadth of meaning which the term was meant to convey.⁵ It is more than probable that it is Paul's way of designating the idea of corporate personality in which the group becomes a partaker in all that the baal is, does, and owns; it is the extension of the force of His being. In a clear expression of this reception of the fulness of Christ by the Church as a process through the effective working of the apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and

¹Paul uses the figurative metaphor of the growth (organic) process to describe the Church as the Body (Col. 2:19, Eph. 4:15) as well as the corporate Temple (Eph. 2:21; cf. S. Hanson, *op.cit.*, p. 133). If the two figures (Temple and Body) are more or less, equivalent, what we have concluded concerning the Key Stone applies with equal force to the designation of the Head and the Husband. It is apart from the whole, yet sums it up. It is another illustration of Hebraic conception of corporate personality.

²That is, in the middle voice, following Lightfoot, S. Hanson, J.A.T. Robinson, L.S. Thornton, Moffatt, and against J. Armitage Robinson, Hodge, Ellicott, and C.A.A. Scott, who take it to be passive.

³S. Hanson, *op.cit.*, p. 128. In Col. 2:9, the fulness of God dwells in Christ bodily. In consequence to this Paul says, "and you are filled in him, who is the head of all rulership and authority (vs. 10). Compare T.F. Torrance's use of the terms "anhypostasia" and "enhypostasia" to describe the existence of the Church as the Body of Christ (*op.cit.*, 10f.).

⁴This is a reference to either the cosmic headship of Christ of that over the Church (cf. S. Hanson, *op.cit.*, p. 129).

⁵Dillistone correctly suggests that the main stress is on the conception of the receiving of the Holy Spirit. "In other words the emphasis is laid upon the Church as the redeemed community receiving from its Head all that it needs for its growth in love," (The Word of God and the People of God, *op.cit.*, p. 59; cf. G.V. Florovsky, *op.cit.*, pp. 53f.).

teachers (Eph. 4:11), Paul looks forward to the attainment of "the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness (πληρώματος) of Christ" (vs. 13). This is the Church possessed of the life of Christ, mediated through the Holy Spirit, existing as an actual corporate personality.¹ The solidarity of the Old Testament and Early Judaism, could only approximate this idea; they could only provide the type while the Church is the anti-type, the real thing. It is not a solidarity which exists as though the ancestor lived on in his progeny but is an actuality through the personal existence of the Holy Spirit in whom each member of the Church participates (κοινωνεῖ).

Our case is herewith concluded. The evidence such as it is, in our estimation, warrants the overall conclusion that Paul does apply Hebraic conceptions of the solidarity of the race or group in building his doctrines of redemption and of the Church. It is only in a Jewish context that Paul's postulations on unity can be rightly understood. Although the application indicates examples of stimulus diffusion and occasionally a completely new development, in the end, the idea comes out of Jewish presuppositions, not Hellenistic philosophy or religious thought.

¹If our analysis of Paul's conception of the Church is correct, a word must be said for the often encountered Catholic designation of the Church as being filled with the "soul" of Christ (cf. e.g. F. Prat, *op.cit.*, II, 288). But it must not be taken out of its Hebrew context as has most often been the case. In our study of the Old Testament conception of the extension of the שְׁמִי, is centered the meaning which we intend by the term "corporate personality" and designates the mysterious unity pervading the solidarity of the closely knit group. Through the giving of the Holy Spirit, the שְׁמִי of Christ is mediated to the Church. This is the pleroma of Christ, so that Paul affirms that those that are joined to Him form one spirit (I Cor. 6:17). In this sense, the Body of Christ would correspond to the Hebrew conception of the גִּבּוֹרִים which was the outward manifestation of the שְׁמִי, and the visible expression of the הֵיכָל. It is for this reason that σώμα and πνεῦμα are parallels although they are viewed from different aspects (E. Percy, *op.cit.*, p. 9ff.).

The Hebrew Conception of the Solidarity of the Individual

Recent studies in the field of Hebrew psychology have raised the problem of the Semitic conception of the individual. If H.W. Robinson is correct in describing the social order of the group as a projection of individual psychology,¹ an understanding of the pertinent elements is essential. Even if there is no relationship between the structure of the Israelite nation and the individual, this study is of great importance for the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ.

Opinion is roughly divided on the question of the relative independence of the members in the body. The case for the disunity of the functions of the parts of the body has been championed by H.W. Robinson and L.H. Brockington. The argument may be considered briefly. In the first instance, Hebrew psychology does not begin with an indwelling soul, but an animated body.² In Pedersen's words, "Sin and body are so intimately united that a distinction cannot be made between them. They are more than 'united': the body is the soul in its outward form."³ Physical, psychical, and spiritual features are more or

¹"The Group and the Individual in Israel," op. cit., p. 154. Cf also Werden u. Wesen, op. cit., p. 52, where reference is made to Plato's Republic, Book iv. Para. 435 "There exist in each of us the same generic parts and characteristics as are found in the state." C.C.J. Webb, Problems in the Relations of God and Man, London, 1911, p. 228, cautions that Plato's use of the individual soul as an analogy to the community is not an analogy at all but an identity of structure; "the community in its structure is and must be the expression of the spiritual nature of its members."

²H.W. Robinson, "The Group and the Individual in Israel," op. cit., p. 154.

³J. Pedersen, I-II, op. cit., p. 171.

less undifferentiated. Furthermore, the organs and limbs without a unifying central organ, partake of a "diffusion of consciousness."¹ They may act quite independently as well as have an ethical quality of their own.² "Not only did the heart and liver, the kidneys and the bowels, possess a quasi-consciousness of their own, but so also did the eye, ear, tongue, hand, and foot."³ Evidence that consciousness was diffused is found in the absence of any strong personal or reflexive pronoun.⁴ Brockington explains the use of the terms נַפְשׁ "soul" (the most frequent), heart, face, and other members to represent the individual, as further support for his contention,⁵ as they commonly occur in that guise.

It is significant that Hebrew has no word for body.⁶ Because body was for him roughly what today would be termed personality, the word "man" was quite adequate to describe body. Consequently, in such an animated body, even the flesh and bones can perform psychical functions,⁷ or be regarded as a center of consciousness.⁸ Thus, we read in Psalm 35:10, "All my bones shall say, Lord who is like unto thee ..." or as in Psalm 63:1, "... my flesh longeth for thee ...". It is not uncommon to find moral quality ascribed to a member of the body more or less in distinction to the body as a whole. For this reason, Job asks, "Is

¹L.H. Brockington, "The Hebrew Conception of Personality in Relation to the Knowledge of God," J.T.S., Vol. 47, 1946, p. 1; cf. H.W. Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology" op. cit., p. 362.

²H.W. Robinson, Werden u. Wesen, op. cit., p. 52.

³H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, op. cit., p. 72.

⁴L.H. Brockington, op. cit., p. 2.

⁵Ibid., p. 2.

⁶H.W. Robinson, Mansfield College Essays, presented to A.M. Fairbairn, London, 1909, pp. 268ff.

⁷E.C. Rust, op. cit., p. 97.

⁸H.W. Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology," op. cit., p. 362.

there iniquity in my tongue? cannot my taste discern perverse things?" (6:30). "A lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises wicked imaginations, and feet that are swift in running to mischief" (Prov. 6:17,18), provides further examples of this phenomenon. H.W. Robinson refuses to see metaphorical usage in Job's question, "Doth not the ear try words even as the palate tasteth its meat?" (12:11), or Job's declaration regarding the poor whom he has helped, "When the ear heard me, then it blessed me: and when the eye saw me, it gave witness unto me" (39:11). Rather, it is the literal expression of the 'diffused consciousness' of Hebrew psychology.¹

A central position in the body is given to the heart (לֵב) it may be comforted with a morsel of bread (Judg. 19:5) or may despise reproof (Prov. 5:12). The conception of the new heart (ps. 51:10), says Robinson, would be taken by them much more literally than by us.² The heart as well as the soul (נֶפֶשׁ), are used in conjunction with an external member to indicate the whole man, e.g., heart and hands (Gen. 20:5), soul and eyes (I Sam. 2:33).³ The significance of this method of coupling is described by Brockington.⁴

The more or less regular use of one or other of these two words to express the centre of thought, will, and emotional energy, indicates a feeling after the unity of the individual, but the diffusion of psycho-physical functioning amongst the external organs is not thereby superseded.

An added importance is attached to the independence of the bodily members. They are more readily made subject to the invasion or control of supernatural

¹Cf. H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament for these references. op. cit., p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 73.

³L.H. Brockington, op. cit., p. 3.

⁴See a list of the frequency of the occurrence of this usage, ibid., p. 3, note, 3.

force. An example of this is afforded by Laban's assertion that ^{it} is "according to the god (power) of my hand," (לֵּבִי וְיָדִי), to do evil to Jacob, "which apparently suggests an invasion of the hand by the demon of anger."¹ So also the mouths of the prophets are susceptible to either a lying or true spirit as in the case of the prophets of Ahab and Micaiah (I Kings 22:21-23).²

A.R. Johnson argues against the foregoing position and its emphasis on the independence of the distinct parts of the body from the central ego. To be sure man was thought of as a psycho-physical organism. This can be seen in the employment of various parts of the body as instruments of the ego (יָדִי וְפִי), as well as by their active engagement in some personal behavior or in their description by some personal quality.³ But even as the flesh (בָּשָׂר) may be used by synecdoche for the whole self (Prov. 9:17, Ps. 63:1,2. Cf. Job 13:14), so the employment was made of the head or the face in an identical manner.⁴ Johnson continues:

It is wholly in line with the foregoing that the psychical functions of the ego should be seen at work in the activities of such peripheral, and in particular, facial organs as the mouth, with its palate, tongue, and lips, or the eyes, and even the forehead, nose, and ears ... They may be referred to by Synecdoche as themselves engaged in some form of moral behaviour subject to moral judgment.⁵

¹H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 73. Cf. Gen. 31:26.

²Cf. Book of Jubilees 25:14, where it is said of Rebecca, "The spirit of righteousness descended into her mouth ..."

³The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, op.cit., p. 39.

⁴Ibid., pp. 44-46.

⁵Ibid., p. 47. A few references out of many possibilities will serve to illustrate this practise. With respect to the mouth, see Gen. 45:12 and Ps. 66:14. The tongue may plan to be contentious as in Ps. 52:4 or the eye be watchful and have a wide range of psychic activity, Job. 24:15a, Prov. 23:26, Ps. 10:8. The hand may effect deliverance (Judg. 7:2), smite someone (Josh. 2:19), shed blood (Deut. 21:7), and so on, just as "... a man's opportunity or the extent of his power is indicated by reference to that which his hand may 'find' (Lev. 25:28) or whatever it may 'reach' (Lev. 5:7)." Ibid., p. 64.

The important contention presented by this writer is the point that the independence of a given member is in actuality only apparent. The frequent examples of an organ or limb in independent action belong to the realm of figurative speech. As one would not interpret literally Psalm 22:15, "My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death," Johnson questions the wisdom of H.W. Robinson's claim that a literal sense is implied when it is said that the flesh longs, the palate discerns or the eye bears witness.¹ When the ear is requested to incline itself, it is the person who is addressed, as the succeeding, "Hearken, O Daughter ..." (Ps. 45:10; Cf. Prov. 4:20), indicates. To conclude otherwise, "... is to overlook the existence of personal pronouns in the rich variety of their independent prefixed, affixed and suffixed forms."²

Little can be done to reconcile these two views³ in so short a space as can be allotted to it; nevertheless, direction might be supplied to the enquiry if the individual were thought of in terms of the Hebrew conception of solidarity. In that case the individual would comprise the closest solidarity possible. That means, the Hebrew conception of the unity of the individual does not differ in kind from the conception of the solidarity of the family, but in degree. So strong is the bond of solidarity in the individual that no member can act in absolute independence. On the other hand, the psychic conception of the body readily let one maintain the notion that the member which carried out the action

¹ Ibid., p. 83, n.3. Cf. H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, op.cit., p. 72; Mansfield College Essays, op.cit., p. 276.

² A.R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual, op.cit., p. 83.

³ W.A. Irwin takes an intermediate position. There is frequent reference to parts of the body which have special functions, "in some cases, near-independence, in human consciousness and action." Irwin continues, "There is no doubt that all members were subordinate to the central consciousness, whatever that was." "The Hebrews", op.cit., p. 277.

was responsible in a unique sense. Without the more modern discovery of the central role of the brain,¹ it would be quite natural to think of the tongue as tasting independently, or the feet as acting merely as agents of locomotion on their own account. For all that, when the occasion is supplied in the activity of the member of the body (e.g. not only is the sight in the eye, but it is capable of passing judgment so that the object seen is determined to be desirable or not), the rest of the body is involved. The implication of the whole in the activity of any single part is required by the unity of the body shown in the universal presence of the blood which contains the נֶפֶשׁ "soul" (Gen. 9:4, Lev. 17:11,14, Deut. 12:23. Cf. Ps. 72:14, 94:21, Prov. 1:18).² Since the "soul" is an indivisible unit, the limb or organ being animated by it must implicate the whole "soul" in its activities. This conclusion is supported by warnings issued by Jesus:

Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life, with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire, (Matt. 18:8f.)

On another occasion, Jesus warned against pride of accomplishment in these words, "... let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth" (Matt. 6:3), which is doubtless figurative speech.³ But one conclusion emerges from this manner of

¹To the Hebrew, the brain was the "marrow" of the head. Cf. H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, op.cit., pp. 71f.; B.D.B., p. 562.

²Cf. J. Pedersen, I-II, op.cit., pp. 179ff.; A.R. Johnson The Vitality of the Individual, op.cit., pp. 89-107. In the Rabbis one encounters the expression, "The soul fills the body." Cf. Deut. R. 2.37; Lev. R. 4.8.

³Cf. 2 Baruch 83:3, "He will assuredly examine the secret thoughts of that which is laid up in the secret chambers of all the members of man." In Midrash Rabba Num. 17.6 (on Num. 15:39) one finds this statement, "The heart and the eyes are the touts of the body, for they lead the body astray."

expressing ideas: it is the hand or eye which produces the occasion of the offence and in so doing implicates the person so that the individual would be in danger of condemnation. If the single member could act independently, the advocated surgery would be superfluous, in view of the fact that the individual member might then receive independent judgment. The solidarity of the individual is of such a character that no part of the body can be involved in a sinful practice without contaminating the whole person. In this way the lustful eye leads the heart into adultery (Matt. 5:28) or brings a divine injunction against covetousness (Ex. 20:17), the prelude to more outward crimes. It will readily be seen that this picture is closely paralleled by the conception of the defilement of the family or the nation by the evil or uncleanness of a constituent member. Thus, there is frequent reference to the cutting off of an Israelite from the nation, as the medium by which the sanctity of the theocracy was to be maintained (cf. Lev. 7:20,21,25,27, 19:8, Ex. 12:15, Num. 19:13,20). The measures of the lex talionis (Lev. 24:17-22) can scarcely be used to support the contention that Israel's laws were modified by the notion of the independence of the parts of the body, since the guilt of any member is not in question when the surrender of the organ is required to make a just restitution. On the other hand, the requirement that the "punishment fit the crime," may bring the principle of solidarity into play. The sin committed may demand more than mere repayment in kind or precise restitution. Thus, when one smote his father or mother, he was not to be smitten in turn, or even have his arms amputated, but was condemned to death. This shows the seriousness of the crime and the indivisible unity of the individual (Ex. 21:15).¹

¹A parallel may be suggested between this penalty and that suffered by Achan. In the former instance, the seriousness of the crime demands more than the restoration in kind or the loss of the limb, so in the gravity of the latter case, more than the death of the single individual is demanded.

Contemplation or meditation is the specific activity of the heart. As the center of the body, it becomes the center also of the soul which is co-extensive with the body. It controls the feelings, wishes, counsels, understanding, and conscience.¹ When any action is the consequence of premeditation, it shows the true character of the heart which in turn describes the man, "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he" (Prov. 23:7). The heart gives unity to the individual and continuity to his character so that the untransformed heart may be described as "... deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked" (Jer. 17:9; cf. Gen. 6:5), or may be replaced by a pure heart (Ps. 51:10) to make the possessor pure.

It is clear that the Hebrew conception of the heart rules out any more than a seriously modified view of the psychic independence of the parts of the body. If the activity is the result of premeditation, then the responsibility cannot pertain to less than the whole person. In such cases as a single member of the body is viewed as being under the control of the heart (i.e. the thought process), the moral quality ascribed to that member must be due to synecdoche.² This must then leave only such instances where the members act independently of the heart, to exemplify "diffused consciousness."

Added to this is the evidence already considered regarding the unity of the soul. If Pedersen is correct in explaining the activity of the individual member as being merely a particularly active part of the soul which at the same time includes the whole soul, all real independence is ruled out. The soul is the

¹H. Schultz, *op.cit.*, p. 248. Cf. Gen. 6:5, 8:21, Ex. 4:21, Josh. 7:5, 11:20, Prov. 4:23, 15:13ff., 16:5, 23, 24:32, Isa. 10:7, 42:25, Ps. 51:10. Note Ecclus. 17:66ff. and Sibylline Oracles III, 762, "Consecrate your minds within your breasts." H.W. Robinson breaks down the Old Testament usage of לֵב "heart", as follows: out of 851 cases, 29 are purely physical, 257 denote the personality, inner life or character in general; 166, the more emotional side of the conscious life, much like nephesh, but almost half denote either the intellectual (240 cases e.g. Prov. 24:32) or the volitional (195 cases, e.g. Jer. 19:5) element. Mansfield College Essays, *op.cit.*, p. 274.

²With which A.R. Johnson concurs in the Vitality of the Individual, *op.cit.*, p. 47.

bond of solidarity between the individual members of the body so that although the organ is the occasion by which the good or evil influence is encountered, the soul is unavoidably implicated and the whole individual is directly involved. For this reason it would be more correct to conclude that the Hebrew thought of the body in terms of diffused vitality rather than consciousness.

With this admission, the identity of structure between the individual and the Israelite society is relinquished.¹ Nevertheless, some elements of similarity remain. As the individual is a unity or members sharing in a single animating *nephes-ruah*, so the family of the nation shared in the common life of the ancestor. As no member of the body was unaffected when another committed evil or good, so the group unit of family or people was universally affected by the moral action of a member of that group. The conception of the group differed from the conception of the individual, precisely in that it had an actually diffused consciousness. The member of the group originated and effected activity which was out of accord with the desire of the group at large (cf. the crime of Achan).

In conclusion we must note that true individuality was grounded in the indivisible responsibility of each man within the group to God (Jer. 31:29f., Ezek. 18 *passim*, Deut. 24:16).² In the same way, the members of the body were not thought of in their distinctiveness from one another, but as aspects of the

¹ Contrast H.W. Robinson's assertion that "social order is a projection of psychology." "The Group and the Individual in Israel," *op.cit.*, p. 154. Might R.M. McIver have had Israel in mind when he warns against the fallacy of giving metaphysical substance to an abstract idea or common nature? He continues, "A community does not act in unity like an organism, or maintain itself like an organism, or die like an organism. The central difference renders the whole analogy vain." *Op.cit.*, pp. 68,71. So also H.C. King, *op.cit.*, pp. 23ff. If any society (of which we have a moderate knowledge) deserves this description in even an attenuated form, it is Israel. G.A.F. Knight says "organism" is a particularly appropriate term. *Op.cit.*, p. 32.

² J.A.T. Robinson, *The Body*, London, 1952, p. 12. Cf. W. Eichrodt, *Man in the Old Testament*, *op.cit.*, pp. 9,23.

whole man in his relation to God.¹ For this reason expressions denoting the functions of members of the body have no physiological or psychological precision but express a profound understanding of man's true nature as answerable to God. Nor is it surprising that synecdoche should be encountered so frequently when it is borne in mind that any part of the body may, as a part of the whole man, uniquely describe the individual's responsibility to God.

We do not wish to retract the conclusion at which we arrived regarding the Church as the New Israel which replaces the Old Israel after the flesh. This point is never denied; the necessity for Israel to be incorporated into the Church is never controverted nor are its theological implications exempted (cf. Rom. 9:6ff.). The salvation of the individual Jew, as that of the individual Gentile, is attained only through incorporation into the eschatological Israel through the acceptance of the New Covenant and through faith in Jesus Christ the Messiah. Paul's problem arises completely on the issue of God's corporate election of national Israel. How can it be that although the promise had specific application to Israel, the Jews have rejected the only means of obtaining the proffered prize of salvation through faith in Christ? Although the Apostle appears to give two answers to this question, there is in fact only one solution and it turns on the question of the solidarity of Israel.

1. The solidarity of Israel. Paul was first reluctant to entertain the view that Israel as a people had been rejected by God. He is sure this divine rejection was warranted because of Israel's stubborn refusal to heed the gospel invitation (cf. Rom. 9:30ff. with Rom. 10:1). With passionate sincerity Paul collaborated in the results of his missionary labor among the Jews; he would willingly exchange his own salvation for that of his own race (cf. 1 Cor. 9:16).

¹J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit., p. 16.

APPENDIX B

Paul's Conception of the Solidarity of Ethnic Israel

No extended discussion of Paul's application of Old Testament and Early Jewish conceptions of the solidarity of the human race would be complete without the mention of his conception of the solidarity of national or ethnic Israel as an entity over against humanity at large as well as distinct from the Church as the New Israel. We do not wish to retract the conclusion at which we arrived regarding the Church as the New Israel which replaces the old Israel after the flesh. This point is never clouded; the necessity for Israel to be incorporated into the Church is never controverted nor are its theological implications exempted (cf. Phil. 3:2ff.). The salvation of the individual Jew, as that of the individual Gentile, is attained only through incorporation into the eschatological Israel through the acceptance of the New Covenant and through faith in Jesus Christ the Messiah. Paul's problem arises completely on the issue of God's corporate election of national Israel.¹ How can it be that although the promise had specific application to Israel, the Jews have rejected the only means of obtaining the proffered prize of salvation through faith in Christ? Although the Apostle appears to give two answers to this question, there is in fact only one solution and it turns on the conception of the solidarity of Israel.

1. The Advantage of Israel. Paul was most reluctant to entertain the view that Israel as a people had been rejected by God. To be sure this divine reaction was warranted because of Israel's stubborn refusal to heed the gospel invitation (cf. Acts 20:25ff. with Rom. 11:1). With passionate sincerity Paul deliberates on the results of his missionary labor among the Jews; he would willingly exchange his own salvation for that of his own race if it were but feasible

¹Cf. G.F. Moore, Judaism, op.cit., I, 542; M.M. Bourke, op.cit., p. 24.

(Rom. 9:3).¹

When Paul considers the benefits which are Israel's by prerogative, two opposing conclusions are drawn. In one sense there is no advantage whatsoever to being a Jew, while in another there are most consequential benefits. Thus, in answer to the questions: "What advantage has the Jew? Or what is the value of circumcision?" (Rom. 3:1), Paul asserts: "Much in every way." To begin with, the Jews are entrusted with the oracles of God. What if some were unfaithful (εἰ ἡ ἀπειθεία τινος)? Does their faithlessness nullify the faithfulness of God? by no means" (3:2ff.). With this incomplete statement, the Apostle breaks off only to resume this line of thought in chapter 9.² Here there is an extensive list of benefits which belong to ethnic Israel:

They are Israelites, and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises; to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed for ever. Amen (Rom. 9:4f. R.S.V.).

This passage clearly shows that Paul is thinking of Israel's solidarity in terms current in the Judaism of his day (cf. supra chap. II). Here there is no consideration of the individual apart from the group. The sonship (ἡ υἱοθεσία), the covenants, or the giving of the law (ἡ νομοθεσία) belong to Israel as a whole. These privileges belong to the group and are mediated by it to the individual. It is of further significance for us to note that Paul did not break with the Jewish conception of ancestral merit (cf. supra pp 122f) in that the phrase,

¹A.D. Nock notes that this passage embodies the idea of corporate salvation. There is no salvation for the individual apart from the group (op.cit., pp 241, 244). Of course, Paul does not go that far, but the idea may not have been far removed from his mind. For a brief but acceptable appraisal and refutation of F.C. Baur's and Harnack's reconstruction of the framework of the particularism and universalism of both Paul and the Early Church, see J. Munck, op.cit., pp. 3ff. Paul never completely divorced his doctrine of the salvation of the Gentiles from the salvation of Israel (Rom. 1:16). It is for this reason that his imprisonment is "because of the hope of Israel" (Acts 28:20), even though he is the missionary to the Gentiles.

²Sanday and Headlam, op.cit., p. 69.

ὡς οἱ πατέρες, designates one among Israel's most prominent blessings.

Elsewhere, Paul says explicitly that Israel is beloved for the sake of the forefathers (Rom. 11:28). Thinking in terms of contemporary solidarity, Paul assumes that it would be more natural that the merit of Christ provided in His vicarious atonement should implicate Israel, because He came of that race according to the flesh.¹

When Paul is thinking of Israel in these corporate terms, the main point is that the rejection of the gospel by some Jews is not the last word nor the end of the matter. There remains, no matter what individuals may do, the unshakable promise of God which guarantees the salvation of all Israel:

Lest you be wise in your own conceits, I want you to understand this mystery brethren: a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles come in, and so all Israel will be saved; as it is written, 'The Deliverer will come from Zion, he will banish ungodliness from Jacob; and this will be my covenant with them when I take away their sins. As regards the gospel they are enemies of God, for your (Gentiles) sake; but as regards election they are beloved for the sake of their forefathers. For the gifts and the call of God are irrevocable (Rom. 11:25ff. R.S.V.).

Since the unit which Paul has in mind is the totality of Israel, any number of individuals, even a majority, may turn from the truth but such an attitude cannot change the unconditional promises of God regarding the salvation and the restoration of Israel. God has the power to engraft again the natural broken branches of Israel; that is less remarkable or objectionable than the engrafting of wild slips (Rom. 11:23f.).

In this corporate sense the salvation of all Israel is assured. πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ

¹Cf. G.A. Danell, *op.cit.*, pp. 35ff. This idea arises out of the recognition of the closer solidarity within the national family relationship than there is in the totality of the race. It is more natural that the atonement should be applied to Israel because Jesus Christ comes from that family group, than to the whole race where the solidarity originating in Adam is more widely diffused.

is to be understood in Paul's thought-context of representative universalism.¹ That generation which turns to the Lord will stand representatively for the whole of Israel stretching back to the call of Abraham.² In this representative sense, the continuity of Israel cannot be abrogated. Ethnic Israel is still embraced in the irrevocable election which is founded on the immutability of God. This is what Paul means when he says, "If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump (note the parallel figure which he applies to the Church in I Cor. 5:6ff.); and if the root is holy, so are the branches" (Rom. 11:16).

By turning to the Old Testament, Paul finds a parallel situation. Although the major part of the nation had rejected the covenant, there remained still the remnant, "the seven thousand who have not bowed their knee to Baal" (Rom. 11:2ff.). It is with relief and conviction that Paul recognizes that even in his own day there is a representative "remnant chosen by grace" out of Israel, the elect who have garnered the reward of the promise (Rom. 11:5f.).³

1. The Rejection of Israel. - In quite another sense, a temporary and individualistic sense, Israel has been rejected. This is clearly brought out in Paul's statement to the Jews of Rome:

The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your fathers through Isaiah the prophet: 'Go to this people, and say, You shall indeed hear but never understand, and shall indeed see but never perceive. For this people's heart has grown dull, and their ears are heavy of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart and turn for me to heal them.' Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen (Acts 28:26ff. R.S.V.).

In this individualistic and temporary context, there is absolutely no difference

¹This is a Semitic idea and does not refer to individual opportunity but to the continuity of the nation represented by one generation or one segment (cf. J. Munck, op.cit., p. 8).

²Cf. K. Stendahl, op.cit., p. 69.

³M.M. Bourke thinks that Rom. 9:6 ("... not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel") is another reference to this remnant rather than to the spiritual children of Abraham. It is therefore not a parallel to Rom. 4:11, as it has often been thought. Op.cit., p. 24.

whatever between the Jews and the Gentiles (Rom. 10:12). Although Israel has been rejected by God, individuals continue to come from among the Jews to trust in Christ and to have the veil removed from their understanding of the Scripture (II Cor. 3:14ff.).

Now, this hardening of Israel is itself the result of the operation of the principle of representative universalism. By applying it to his own generation, Paul deduces that the gospel has gone out into the whole earth (Rom. 10:14ff. Note the quotation of Psalm 19 and Isaiah 53.). In this connection, J. Munck points out:

If however the words of the quotation (Ps. 19, "Their sound went out into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world") are taken literally, they mean that the apostles who were sent forth to the Jews have now finished their task ... The parts to which they have preached stand for the whole, the Jewish people. Therefore Paul is able to assert that Israel is unbelieving and stubborn as he does in the passage which follows.¹

Those that have had the opportunity to hear the gospel have made the decision which binds the whole of Israel under the judgment of the hardening of God.

This hardening is, however, only a temporary expedient that the Gentiles might be given a share in the dispensation of the grace of God (Rom. 10:11f.). It could never mean the complete and irrevocable by-passing of the Jewish mission, for the salvation of the Gentiles is itself integrally related to the restoration of all Israel (Rom. 11:12). The gospel is offered first of all to the Jew (Rom. 1:16) "in order to win them and Jerusalem, and thus through representative universalism, the whole."²

¹Op.cit., p. 8.

²J. Munck, op.cit., p. 10. On the surface, this point would seem to warrant the conclusion that preaching to the Gentiles was a waste of time and effort as long as the salvation of Israel was the decisive event which would (as the Old Testament prophecy maintained) be the means of winning the Gentiles. But the hardness of Israel's heart in their rejection of Christ and His apostles, meant a turning to the Gentiles that the Jews might be enticed through jealousy to turn to the Lord (Rom. 11:14) (cf. J. Munck, op.cit., pp. 10f.). Thus, the reversal of the original program of God is one of expediency.

3. Conclusion. - Although Paul by no means accepted a very common and current Jewish opinion that every single Israelite would be saved, and be included in the eschatological Age of blessing, (cf. supra p. 190), he faithfully maintains the conception of the solidarity of Israel. In applying the idea of representative universalism it is possible for him to say, "all Israel will be saved." There is furthermore the additional factor of the continuity of Israel seen in the remnant of Jews who have believed the gospel. This thread of continuity will not be broken nor the promises of God abrogated. In its corporate application, the culmination of the continuity of Israel will be the incorporation of all Israel into the true People of God. In fine, for Paul, the bond of Israel's solidarity is no longer determined by the Old Covenant of Sinai which was abrogated by Christ (II.Co. 3:4ff.; Gal. 3:13f.),¹ but rather by the corporate election of Israel which has been sealed by the prophetic promises of God.

Encyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, ed. J. Hastings, 10 vols., New York, 1898.

The New Testament of Discipleship, trans. and notes, W. B. Eerdmans, New York, 1951.

The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J. Hastings, 10 vols., Edinburgh, 1906-1926.

Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, J. H. Thayer, New York, 1883.

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, ed. J. Hastings, 5 vols., Edinburgh, 1898.

A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, F. Brown, S. Driver, C. A. Briggs, Oxford, 1907 (reprinted 1953).

The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. J. Singer, et al., 12 vols., New York and London, 1901-1906.

The Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. H. St. John, Edinburgh, 1898.

Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libris, ed. L. Fickler and A. Schaeffer, Leipzig, 1955.

Lexicon of the New Testament, E. Crum, 1901, 2 vols., Edinburgh.

¹Cf. F. Prat, op.cit., II, 205f.

The Bible, ed. J. H. Thayer, New York, 1883.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Major Reference Works

- Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible, ed. R. Young, 8th ed., London and Redhill, 1939.
- The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ed. R.H. Charles, 2 vols., Oxford, 1913.
- The Authorized Jewish Daily Prayer Book, ed. I. Singer, 9th ed., London, 1912.
- The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein, London, 1935-1952.
- The Cambridge Ancient History, various editors, Cambridge, 1923-1939.
- Concordance to the Greek Testament, eds. W.F. Moulton, A.S. Geden, 2nd ed., Edinburgh, 1899.
- Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament, E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, Oxford, 1897.
- Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, eds. J. McClintock and J. Strong, Vol. V, 1891.
- The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, trans. and notes, W.H. Brownlee, New Haven, Conn., 1951.
- The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J. Hastings, 13 vols., Edinburgh, 1908-1926.
- Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, J.H. Thayer, New York, 1899.
- Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, ed. J. Hastings, 5 vols., Edinburgh, 1898.
- A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, F. Brown, S.R. Driver, C.A. Briggs, Oxford, 1907 (corrected impression, 1952).
- The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. I. Singer, et al, 12 vols., New York and London, 1901-1906.
- The Works of Flavious Josephus, trans. W. Whiston, Edinburgh, n.d.
- Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, eds. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Leiden, 1953.
- Lexicon of the New Testament, H. Cremer, trans. W. Urwick, 3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1880.
- The Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, T.E. Page, W.H.D. Rouse, London, various dates.

Mekilta de-Rabbi Ismael, ed. and trans., J.Z. Lauterbach, Philadelphia, 1933-5,
(3 vols.).

Midrash Rabba, trans. and ed., H. Freedman and M. Simon, London, 1939,
(10 vols.).

Mishna, trans. and ed., H. Danby, Oxford, 1933.

Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, trans., H. de Romestin, Vol. X, Oxford and New
York, 1896.

The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, ed. H.B. Swete, 2nd ed.,
3 vols., Cambridge, 1895-1899.

PirKê de Rabbi Eliezer, trans., G. Friedlander, London, 1916.

A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. A. Richardson, London, 1950.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhardt Kittel, 4 vols and
supplements, Stuttgart, 1933-

The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, Vol. I, 1939.

Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, S. Mandelkern, Lipsiae, n.d.

Recent Books

Abbott, T.K. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the
Ephesians and to the Colossians, Edinburgh, 1897.

Abelson, J. The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, London, 1912.

Abrahams, I. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 2nd series, Cambridge, 1924.

Albright, W.F. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, Baltimore, 1942. 2nd ed.,
1946.

Asting, R. Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum, Göttingen, 1930.

Astley, H.J.D. Biblical Anthropology, London, 1929.

Baab, O.J. The Theology of the Old Testament, Nashville, 1939.

Bacon, B.W. The Story of St. Paul, Boston, 1904.

Barry, F.R. Christianity and Psychology, 5th ed., London, 1933.

Barth, K. The Epistle to the Romans, trans. E. Hoskyns, London, 1933.

_____. The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism, trans., E.A. Paine,
London, 1954.

_____. Christus und Adam nach Röm 5, Zurich, 1952.

- Baur, F.C. The Church History of the First Three Centuries, Vol. I, trans. A. Menzies, London, 1878.
- _____. Paul: His Life and Works, trans. A. Menzies, Vol. II, London, 1875.
- Beare, F.W. The First Epistle of Peter, Oxford, 1947.
- Beet, J.A. The Church, the Churches and the Sacraments, London, 1907.
- Bennet, W.H. The Theology of the Old Testament, London, 1896.
- Bentzen, A. Messias, Moses redivivus, Menschensohn, Zürich, 1948.
- _____. Introduction to the Old Testament, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Copenhagen, 1952.
- Bersier, E. The Oneness of the Race, trans. A. Harwood, London, 1871.
- Best, E. One Body in Christ, London, 1955.
- Beyschlag, W. New Testament Theology, trans. N. Buchanan, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1896.
- Bicknell, E.J. The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin, London, 1923.
- Bourke, M.M. A Study of the Metaphor of the Olive Tree in Romans XI, Washington, 1947.
- Bousset, W. Die Religion des Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 3rd ed., rev. and ed. Gressmann, Tübingen, 1926.
- _____. Kyrios Christos, 2nd ed., Göttingen, 1921.
- Boylan, F.C. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Dublin, 1934.
- Braude, W.G. Jewish Proselyting in the First Centuries of the Common Era, Providence, R.I., 1940.
- Briggs, C.A. The Book of Psalms, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1907.
- Bright, John. The Kingdom of God, New York, 1953.
- Bruce, A.B. St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, New York, 1907.
- Brunner, E. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, (Dogmatics II), trans. O. Wyon, London, 1952.
- _____. Man in Revolt, trans. O. Wyon, London, 1939.
- _____. The Misunderstanding of the Church, Philadelphia, 1953.
- Büchler, A. Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century, London, 1928.
- Bultmann, R. Jesus and the Word, trans. L.P. Smith, E. Huntress, London, 1935.

- Bultmann, R. Theology of the New Testament, trans. K. Grobel, Vol. I, London, 1952.
- Burrows, M. An Outline of Biblical Theology, Philadelphia, 1946.
- Burton, E.D. The Epistle to the Galatians, New York, 1920.
- Caird, J. Fundamental Principles of Christianity, Vol. I, Glasgow, 1899.
- Calvin, J. The Epistle to the Ephesians, trans. Wm. Pringle, Grand Rapids, 1948.
- Carrington, P. The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge, 1940.
- Causse, A. Israël et la Vision de l'Humanité, Strasbourg-Paris, 1924.
- Chajes, Z.H. The Student's Guide through the Talmud, London, 1952.
- Champion, L. The Church of the New Testament, London, 1915.
- Charles, R.H. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, London, 1917.
- Chavasse, C. The Bride of Christ, London, 1940.
- Cochrane, C.N. Christianity and Classical Culture, Oxford, 1940.
- Cohen, A. Everyman's Talmud, London, 1932.
- Cook, S.A. The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. III, Cambridge, 1925.
- _____. The Old Testament: A Reinterpretation, Cambridge, 1936.
- Craig, C.T. The One Church, London, 1952.
- Cullmann, O. Baptism in the New Testament, London, 1950.
- _____. Christ and Time, trans. F.V. Filson, London, 1951.
- Dahl, N.A. Das Volk Gottes, Oslo, 1941.
- Dalman, G. The Words of Jesus, Edinburgh, 1902.
- Daube, D. Studies in Biblical Law, Cambridge, 1947.
- Davidson, A.B. The Theology of the Old Testament, Edinburgh, 1904.
- Davies, W.D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1948.
- Deissmann, A. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. W.E. Wilson, London, 1926.
- Denney, J. Studies in Theology, 3rd ed., London, 1895.

- Denney, J. Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, Göttingen, 1909.
- Dibelius, Martin. Gospel Criticism and Christology, London, 1935.
- Dickson, W.P. St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit, Glasgow, 1883.
- Dillistone, F.W. The Structure of the Divine Society, London, 1951.
- _____. The Word of God and the People of God, London, 1948.
- Dobschütz, E. von. Christian Life in the Primitive Church, trans. G. Bremner, London, 1904.
- Dodd, C.H. According to the Scriptures, London, 1952.
- _____. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, London, 1936.
- _____. The Communion of Saints, Cambridge, Mass., 1936.
- _____. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, London, 1932.
- _____. Man in God's Design, Newcastle, 1952.
- Dodd, C.H. The Meaning of Paul for Today, London, 1920.
- _____. The Old Testament in the New, London, 1952.
- Dods, M., and others. An Exposition of the Bible, Vol. I, Hartford, Conn., 1903.
- Dressel, A.R.M., ed. Clementis Romani, Homiliae Viginti, Gottingae, 1853.
- Duncan, G.S. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, London, 1937.
- _____. Jesus, Son of Man, London, 1947.
- Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, trans. M. Rowley, Oxford, 1952.
- Eichrodt, W. Theologie des Alten Testaments, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1933 and Zurich, 1948.
- _____. Man in the Old Testament, London, 1951.
- Fairbairn, A.M. Studies in Religion and Theology, London, 1910.
- Feine, P. Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Leipzig, 1910.
- Feldman, A. The Parables and Similies of the Rabbis, Cambridge, 1924.
- Filson, F.V. St. Paul's Conception of Recompense, Leipzig, 1931.
- Flew, R.N. The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology, London, 1934.

- Flew, R.N. Jesus and His Church, 2nd ed., London, 1943.
- _____. The Nature of the Church, London, 1952.
- Forsyth, P.T. The Church and the Sacraments, London, 1917 (reprint 1953).
- Frankfort, H. Kingship and the Gods, Chicago, 1948.
- Fridrichsen, A., ed. The Root of the Vine, Edinburgh, 1953.
- Gaster, T.H. Passover: its History and Traditions, New York, 1949.
- Gavin, F. The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments, London, 1928.
- George, A. Raymond. Communion with God, London, 1953.
- Ginsberg, H.L. Legends of the Jews, 7 vols., Philadelphia, 1910-1938.
- Glover, T.R. Paul of Tarsus, London, 1925.
- Goodenough, E.R. By Light, Light, New Haven, 1935.
- Graham, W.C., and H.G. May. Culture and Conscience, Chicago, 1936.
- Gray, G.B. The Divine Discipline of Israel, London, 1900.
- Green, A.A. The Revised Hagada, London, 1898.
- Grossouw, W. In Christ, trans. from 2nd ed., M.W. Schoenberg, Westminster, Md., 1952.
- Guignebert, C. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. S.H. Hooke, New York, 1939.
- Hanson, Stig. The Unity of the Church in the New Testament, Uppsala, 1946.
- Headlam, A.C. St. Paul and Christianity, London, 1913.
- Hebert, A.G. The Bible from Within, London, 1950.
- _____. The Throne of David, London, 1941.
- Herford, R.T. Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, London, 1903.
- Holmes, P. The Anti-Pelagian Works of St. Augustine, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1872.
- Holtzmann, H.J. Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1911.
- Hooke, S.H., ed. The Labyrinth, London, 1935.
- Hopwood, P.G.S. The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church, Edinburgh, 1936.
- Hort, F.J. The Christian Ecclesia, London, 1908.

- Hort, F.J. The Way the Truth the Life, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 1894.
- Hoskyns, E., and Davey, N. The Riddle of the New Testament, London, 1931.
- Hunter, A.M. Paul and His Predecessors, London, 1940.
- Ireneaus. The Treatise of Ireneaus of Lugdunum against the Heresies, trans. F.R.M. Hatchcock, Vol. II, London, 1916.
- Irwin, W.A. The Old Testament: Keystone of Human Culture, New York, 1952.
- Jackson, F., and Lake, K. The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I, London, 1939.
- Jeremias, J. The Parables of Jesus, trans. 3rd G. ed., S.H. Hooke, London, 1954.
- Johnson, A.R. The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, Cardiff, 1942.
- _____. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, Cardiff, 1949.
- Johnston, George. The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament, Cambridge, 1943.
- Kadushin, M. Organic Thinking, New York, 1938.
- _____. The Rabbinic Mind, New York, 1952.
- Keil, C.F., and Delitzsch, F. Joshua, Judges, Ruth, trans. J. Martin, Edinburgh, 1880.
- Kennedy, H.A.A. St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, London, 1913.
- _____. St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things, London, 1904.
- _____. The Theology of the Epistles, London, 1919.
- Kepler, T.S. Contemporary Thinking about Paul, New York, 1950.
- King, E.G. The Yalkut of Zechariah, Cambridge, 1882.
- King, H.C. Theology and the Social Consciousness, New York, 1902.
- Klausner, J. From Jesus to Paul, trans. W.F. Stinespring, New York, 1944.
- _____. Jesus of Nazareth, trans. H. Danby, London, 1925.
- Knight, G.A.F. From Moses to Paul, London, 1949.
- Knox, W.L. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, Cambridge, 1925.

- Koester, W. Die Idee der Kirche beim Apostel Paulus, Münster i.w., 1928.
- Kohler, K. Jewish Theology, New York, 1918.
- Köhler, Ludwig. Theologie des Alten Testaments, Tübingen, 1947.
- Kraeling, C.H. Anthropos and Son of Man, New York, 1947.
- Lacy T.A. The One Body and the One Spirit, London, 1925.
- Lagrange, M.-J. Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ, Paris, 1931.
- _____. Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, Paris, 1909.
- _____. St. Paul Épitre aux Romains, Paris, 1916.
- Lake, K. The Earlier Epistles of S. Paul, London, 1930.
- Laidlaw, J. The Bible Doctrine of Man, Edinburgh, 1895.
- Lawrence, T.E. The Seven Pillars of Wisdom, London, 1935.
- Leuba, Jean-Louis. The New Testament Pattern, trans. H. Knight, London, 1953.
- Levison, N. The Jewish Background of Christianity, Edinburgh, 1932.
- Levy, S. Original Virtue and Other Short Studies, London, 1907.
- Lévy-Bruhl. How Natives Think, trans. L.A. Clark, London, 1926.
- Lewis, C.S. The Allegory of Love, Oxford, 1936.
- Lietzmann, H. An die Römer, (H.B.z.N.T.), 3 auf., Tübingen, 1928.
- _____. The Beginnings of the Christian Church, New York, 1949.
- Lightfoot, J.B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, London, 1868.
- _____. The Epistles of St. Paul to the Colossians and Philemon, London, 1886.
- _____. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, 10th ed., London, 1890.
- Lindsay, T.M. The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, London, 1902.
- Lods, A. Israel: from its Beginning to the Middle of the Eighth Century, trans. S.H. Hooke, London, 1932.
- Lohmeyer. Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie, Tübingen, 1929.
- _____. Kyrios Jesus, Heidelberg, 1928.
- McCown, C.C. Munera Studiosa, eds. M.H. Shepherd and S.H. Johnson, Cambridge, Mass., 1946 in Kepler, T.S., Contemporary Thinking about Paul, New York, 1950.

- Macgregor, G.H.C. and Purdy, A.C. Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ, New York, 1936.
- MacIver, R.M. Community, London, 1917.
- MacKintosh, R. Christianity and Sin, London, 1913.
- Maclear. The Book of Joshua, "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," ed. J.J.S. Perowne, Cambridge, 1904.
- McNeile, A.H. New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's, Cambridge, 1923.
- Manson, Wm. Jesus the Messiah, London, 1943.
- Manson, T.W. The Servant Messiah, Cambridge, 1953.
- _____. The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge, 1931.
- Mansel, H.L. The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries, London, 1875.
- Marmorstein, A. The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature, London, 1920.
- Marsh, H.G. The Origin and Significance of New Testament Baptism, Manchester, 1941.
- Martensen, H.L. Christian Dogmatics, trans. W. Urwick, Edinburgh, 1895.
- Mascall, E.L. Christ, the Christian and the Church, London, 1946.
- Micklem, N. A First Century Letter, London, 1921.
- _____. The Open Light, London, 1919.
- Moe, O. The Apostle Paul, His Life and His Work, trans. L.A. Vigness, Minneapolis, 1950.
- Moffatt, J. Paul and Paulinism, London, 1910.
- _____. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, London, 1938.
- Montefiore, C.G. Judaism and St. Paul, London, 1914.
- Montefiore, C.G., and Loewe, H. A Rabbinic Anthology, London, 1938.
- Moore, G.F. History of Religions, Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1920.
- _____. Judaism, 3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1927.
- Morgan, W. The Religion and Theology of Paul, Edinburgh, 1917.
- Mowinkel, S. Psalmstudien, Kristiania, 5 vols., 1921-1923.
- Mozley, J.B. Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, 3rd ed., London, 1884.

- Neubauer, A. and Driver, S.R. The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to Jewish Interpreters, 2 vols., Oxford, 1876.
- Newbigin, L. The Household of God, London, 1953.
- Nock, A.D. St. Paul, London, 1938.
- Norden, E. Agnostos Theos, Leipzig, Berlin, 1913.
- North C.R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, London, 1948.
- Noth, M. Geschichte Israels, Göttingen, 1950.
- Nygrew, A. Agape and Eros, trans. P.S. Watson, London, 1953.
- _____. Commentary on the Romans, trans. C.C. Rasmussen, Philadelphia, 1949.
- Nygrew, A. and Auleu, G. This is the Church, Philadelphia, 1952.
- Oehler, G.F. Theology of the Old Testament, trans. G.E. Day, New York, 1883.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, Oxford, 1925.
- Oesterley, W.O.W. and Box, G.H. Religion and Worship of the Synagogue, London, 1907.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H. Hebrew Religion, 2nd ed., London, 1937.
- Orr, James. Sin as a Problem of Today, New York, n.d.
- Otto, R. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, trans. F.V. Filson, B.L. Woolf, London, 1938.
- Patterson, C.H. The Philosophy of the Old Testament, New York, 1953.
- Peake, A.S. The Quintessence of Paulinism, Manchester, 1916.
- Pedersen, J. Israel: Its Life and Culture, I-II, trans. A. Møller, London, 1926.
- _____. Israel: Its Life and Culture, III-IV, trans. A.I. Fausbøll, London, 1940.
- Percy, E. Der Leib Christi, Lund, 1942.
- Pfeiffer, R.H. History of New Testament Times, New York, 1949.
- Pfleiderer, O. Paulinism, trans. E. Peters, 2 vols., London, 1877.
- _____. Primitive Christianity, trans. W. Montgomery, Vol. I, London, 1906.
- Phythian-Adams, W.J. The People and the Presence, Oxford, 1942.
- _____. The Fulness of Israel, Oxford, 1938.

- Pittenger, W.N. His Body the Church, New York, 1945.
- Powell, H.T. The Fall of Man, London, 1934.
- Prat, F. The Theology of St. Paul, 2 vols. trans. J.L. Stoddard, London, 1945.
- Quell, and others. Sin, Bible Key Words, (T.W.N.T.), trans. J.R. Coates, New York, 1951.
- Rackham, R.B. The Acts of the Apostles, 12th ed., London, 1939.
- Rall, H.F. According to Paul, New York, 1947.
- Rankin, O.S. Israel's Wisdom Literature, Edinburgh, 1936.
- Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 3rd ed., Leipzig, Berlin, 1927.
- _____. Poimandres, Leipzig, 1904.
- Rengstorff, K.H. Apostleship, Bible Key Words, (T.W.N.T.) trans. J.R. Coates, London, 1952.
- Riderbos, H.N. The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, Grand Rapids, 1953.
- Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, Edinburgh, 1911.
- Robinson, H.W. The Christian Doctrine of Man, Edinburgh, 1911.
- _____. Mansfield College, Essays, presented to A.M. Fairbairn, London, 1909.
- _____. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, Oxford, 1946.
- _____. Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, London, 1913.
- _____. The Cross of the Servant, London, 1926.
- Robinson, J. Armitage. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1903.
- Robinson, J.A.T. The Body, London, 1952.
- Robinson, Wm. The Biblical Doctrine of the Church, St. Louis, 1948.
- Rowley, H.H. Israel's Mission to the World, London, 1939.
- _____. The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, London, 1944.
- _____. The Rediscovery of the Old Testament, London, 1945.
- _____. The Relevance of the Apocalyptic, London, 1944.

- Rowley, H.H. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament, London, 1952.
- Rust, E.C. Nature and Man in Biblical Thought, London, 1953.
- Rylands, L.G. The Beginnings of Gnostic Christianity, London, 1940.
- Sanday, W. and Headlam, A.C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Edinburgh, 1895.
- Schechter, S.S. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, London, 1909.
- _____. Studies in Judaism, Philadelphia, 1908.
- Schmidt, K.L. The Church, Bible Key Words, (T.W.N.T.), trans. J.R. Coates, London, 1950.
- Schmidt, T. Der Leib Christi, Leipzig-Erlangen, 1919.
- Schultz, H. Old Testament Theology, trans. J.A. Paterson, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1898.
- Schürer, E. The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, trans. S. Taylor and P. Christy, Div. II, Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1885.
- Schweitzer, Albert. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. W. Montgomery, London, 1931.
- _____. St. Paul and His Interpreters, trans. W. Montgomery, London, 1912.
- Scott, C.A.A. Christianity According to St. Paul, Cambridge, 1939.
- _____. The Fellowship of the Spirit, London, 1921.
- Scott, E.F. The Pastoral Epistles, London, n.d.
- Seesemann. Der Begriff $\chi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\omega\nu\iota\varsigma$ im Neuen Testament, Giessen, 1933.
- Sharpe, S., ed. and E.T. The Epistle of Barnabas, London, 1880.
- Sheehan, M.J. The Mysteries of Christianity, trans. C. Vollert, London, 1946.
- Sheldon, H.C. New Testament Theology, New York, 1911.
- Snaith, N.H. Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London, 1944.
- _____. The Jewish New Year Festival, London, 1947.
- Soderblom. The Mystery of the Cross, trans. A.G. Hebert, London, 1933.
- Soiron, T. Die Kirche als der Leib Christi, Düsseldorf, 1951.
- Somerville, D. St. Paul's Conception of Christ, Edinburgh, 1897.
- Smith, C. Ryder. The Bible Doctrine of Sin, London, 1953.

- Smith, C. Ryder. The Bible Doctrine of Society, Edinburgh, 1920.
- Smith, W.R. Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, Cambridge, 1885.
- _____. The Religion of the Semites, 3rd ed., London, 1927.
- Steirman, A. Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments, Vol. II, Berlin, 1912.
- Stevens, G.B. The Pauline Theology, London, 1892.
- _____. The Theology of the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1899.
- Stewart, J.S. A Man in Christ, London, 1938.
- Strack, H.L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, Philadelphia, 1931.
- _____, and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, München, 1928, (4 Vols.)
- Streeter, B.H. The Primitive Church, London, 1929.
- Ström, A.V. Religion och Gemenskap, Uppsala, 1946.
- Tasker, R.V.G. The Old Testament in the New Testament, 2nd ed., London, 1954.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, London, 1940.
- _____. Jesus and His Sacrifice, London, 1937.
- Tennant, F.R. The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin, Cambridge, 1903.
- _____. The Concept of Sin, Cambridge, 1912.
- _____. The Origin and Propagation of Sin, Cambridge, 1906.
- Thackeray, H.St.J. The Relations of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, London, 1900.
- _____. The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, 2nd ed., London, 1923.
- Thomas, J.E. The Problem of Sin in the New Testament, London, 1927.
- Thornton, L.S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ, 2nd ed., London, 1944.
- _____. The Incarnate Lord, London, 1928.
- Torrance, T.F. The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church in the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1954.
- Torrey, C.C. The Second Isaiah, Edinburgh, 1928.
- Van Oosterzee, J.J. The Theology of the New Testament, trans. M.J. Evans, London, 1870.

- Wahlstrom, E.H. The New Life in Christ, Philadelphia, 1950.
- Wallis, L. Sociological Study of the Bible, Chicago, 1912.
- Webb, C.C.J. Problems in the Relations of God and Man, London, 1911.
- Weber, F. Jüdische Theologie, Leipzig, 1897.
- _____. System der Altsynagogalen Palästnischen Theologie, Leipzig, 1880.
- Weinel, H. Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen, 1911.
- Weiss, Bernard. Biblical Theology of the New Testament, trans. D. Eaton, 2 Vols., Edinburgh, 1882.
- Weiss, Johannes. The History of Primitive Christianity, ed. in E.T., F.C. Grant, London, 1937.
- Weizsäcker, C. The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, trans. J. Millar, Vol. I, London, 1894.
- Welch, A.C. Post-exilic Judaism, Edinburgh, 1935.
- Wernle, P. The Beginnings of Christianity, trans. G.A. Bienemann, Vol. I, London, 1903.
- Williams, A.L. trans. Justin Martyr, the Dialogue with Trypho, London, 1930.
- Williams, N.P. The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin, London, 1927.
- Willoughby. Pagan Regeneration, Chicago, 1929.
- Woods, J. The Old Testament in the Church, London, 1949.
- Wrede, W. Paul, trans. E. Lummis, London, 1907.
- Wright, G.E. The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, London, 1954.
- _____. The Old Testament against its Environment, Chicago, 1950.
- Zahn, Th. Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1909.

Articles and Essays

- Barrett, C.K. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," J.T.S., Vol. 48, 1947.
- Barton, G.A. "The Kinship of Gods and Men Among Early Semites," J.B.L., Vol. 15, 1896.
- Bevan, A.A. "The King of Tyre in Ezekiel XXVIII," J.T.S., Vol. 4, 1903.
- Bindley, T.H. "Fresh Light Upon Philippians II, 5-8," Expositor, Dec., 1923.

- Campbell, J.Y. "The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word ἐκκλησία," J.T.S., Vol. 49, 1948.
- _____. "Κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament," J.B.L., Vol. 51, 1932.
- _____. "The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man," J.T.S., Vol. 48, 1947.
- Christie, F.A. "One Body in Christ, Romans 12, I Cor. 12," J.B.L., Vol. 16, 1897.
- Cook, S.A. "Notes" appended to the 3rd edition of W.R. Smith, Religion of the Semites, Chicago, 1944.
- Creed, J.M. "The Heavenly Man," J.T.S., Vol. 26, 1925.
- Cronbach, A. "New Studies in the Psychology of Judaism," H.U.C.A., Vol. 19, 1945-6.
- Dandl, G.A. "The Idea of God's People in the Bible," The Root of the Vine.
- David, M. "The Codex Hammurabi and its Relation to Provisions of Law in Exodus," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Vol. VII, Leiden, 1950.
- Dix, G.H. "The Messiah ben Joseph," J.T.S., Vol. 27, 1926.
- Dodd, C.H. "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development," Rep. from B.J.R.L., Vol. 18, Manchester, 1934.
- _____. "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet," Mysterium Christi, eds. G.K.A. Bell and A. Deissmann, London, 1930.
- Engel, L. "Sigmund Freud," Science Digest, Vol. 35, no. 6, June, 1954.
- Florovsky, G.V. "Sobornost," The Church of God, ed. E.L. Mascall, London, 1934.
- Fridrichsen, A. "Jesus, St. John, and St. Paul," The Root of the Vine.
- Ginsberg, L. "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant," Vetus Testamentum, Vol. III, Leiden, 1953.
- _____. "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings," J.B.L., Vol. 41, 1922.
- Gispen, W.H. "Clean and Unclean," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Vol. 5, 1948.
- Goguel, M. "L'Idée d'Église dans le Nouveau Testament," Origine et Nature de l'Église, Paris, 1939.
- Hatch, W.H.P. "Τὰ στοιχεῖα in Paul and Bardaisan," J.T.S., Vol. 28, 1927.
- Heaton, E.W. "The Root ῥίζη and the Doctrine of the Remnant," J.T.S. New Series, Vol. III, April, 1952.

- Hicks, R.L. "The Jewish Background of the New Testament Doctrine of the Church," A.T.R., Vol. 30, 1948.
- Hinks, E.Y. "The Meaning of the Phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Gal. 4:3 and Vol. 2:8," J.B.L., Vol. 15, 1896.
- Hooke, S.H. "The Myth and Ritual Pattern in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic," The Labyrinth.
- _____. "The Theory and Practice of Substitution," Vetus Testamentum, Vol. II, Leiden, 1952.
- Irwin, W.A. "The Hebrews," The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man, ed. H. Frankfort, Chicago, 1946.
- James, E.O. "Initiatory Rituals," Myth and Ritual, ed. S.H. Hooke, Oxford, 1933.
- _____. "The Sources of Christian Ritual," The Labyrinth.
- Johnson, A.R. "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," The Labyrinth.
- _____. "Divine Kingship and the Old Testament," Ex.T., Vol. 62, 1950.
- Jourdan, G.V. "Κοινωνία in I Corinthians 10:6," J.B.L., Vol. 67, 1948.
- Kadushin, M. "Some Aspects of the Rabbinic Concept of Israel," H.U.C.A., Vol. 19, 1945-6.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. "The Last Supper," Ex.T., Vol. 64, 1952.
- Kohler, K. "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions," H.U.C.A., Vol. I, 1924.
- Lattey, C. "Vicarious Solidarity in the Old Testament," Vetus Testamentum, Vol. I, Leiden, 1951.
- Lindeskog, G. "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," The Root of the Vine, ed. A. Fridrichsen, Edinburgh, 1953.
- Lods, A. "Les Antécédents de la Notion d'Église en Israël," Origine et Nature de l'Église en Israël, Paris, 1939.
- _____. "Origins of the Religion of Israel," Record and Revelation, ed. A.W. Robinson, Oxford, 1938.
- Macgregor, G.H.C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," New Testament Studies, Cambridge, Vol. I, 1954.
- McCree, W.T. "The Covenant Meal in the Old Testament," J.B.L., Vol. 45, 1926.
- Manson, Wm. "The Biblical Doctrine of Mission," I.R.M., Vol. 42, July, 1953.

- Manson, Wm. "Mission and Eschatology," I.R.M., Vol. 42, Oct. 1953.
- _____. "Baptism in the Church," S.J.T., Vol. II, 1949.
- Manson, T.W. "A Parallel to a New Testament Use of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$," J.T.S., Vol. 37, 1936.
- Moore, G.F. "The Last Adam," J.B.L., Vol. 16, 1897.
- Munck, J. "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament," J.T.S., New Series, Vol. 2, 1951.
- North, C.R. "The Suffering Servant: Current Scandinavian Discussions," S.J.T., Vol. III, 1950.
- Nygren, A. "Christ and the Forces of Destruction," S.J.T., Vol. IV, 1951.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. "Early Hebrew Festival Rituals," Myth and Ritual.
- Owen, E.C.E. " $\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ and $\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$," J.T.S., Vol. 37, 1936.
- Porter, F.C. "The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul," J.B.L., Vol. 41, 1922.
- _____. "The Yecer Hara," Biblical and Semitic Studies, Yale Bicentennial Publications, New Haven, 1901.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. "Corpus Christi," in Mysterium Christi.
- Richards, G.C. "Parallels to the New Testament Use of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$," J.T.S., Vol. 38, 1937.
- Riesenfeld. "The Ministry in the New Testament," The Root of the Vine.
- Roberts, B.J. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament Scriptures," Reprint from B.J.R.L., Vol. 36, Sept., 1953.
- Robinson, H.W. "The Group and the Individual in Israel," The Individual in East and West, ed. E.R. Hughes, London, 1937.
- _____. "Hebrew Psychology," The People and the Book, ed. A.S. Peake, Oxford, 1925.
- _____. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," Werden und Wesen Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 66, Berlin, 1936.
- Rowley, H.H. "The Covenanters of Damascus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," B.J.R.L., Vol. 35, 1952-3.
- _____. "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," Reprint from B.J.R.L., Vol. 33, Sept., 1950.
- Sahlin, H. "The New Exodus of Salvation According to S. Paul," The Root of the Vine.

- Schoeps, H.J. "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology," trans. R.H. Pfeiffer, J.B.L., Vol. 65, 1946.
- Sheen, F.J. "The Mystical Body of Christ," Ecclesiastical Review, Vol. 3, 1935.
- Stendahl, K. "The Called and the Chosen," The Root of the Vine.
- Stewart, J.S. "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology," S.J.T., Vol. IV, 1951.
- Temant, F.R. "The Teaching of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom on the Introduction of Sin and Death," J.T.S., Vol. 2, 1901.
- Torrey, C.C. "The Messiah Son of Ephraim," J.B.L., Vol. 66, 1947.
- Williams, A.L. "'My Father' in Jewish Thought of the First Century," J.T.S., Vol. 31, 1930.

Unpublished Material

- Wood, C.A. St. Paul's Conception of the Humanity of Jesus Christ, Ph.D. thesis, New College, Edinburgh University, 1954.